WAYS TO LASTING PEACE

DAVID · STARR · JORDAN

Malbone W. Graham
July 21, 1938

WAYS TO LASTING PEACE

WAYS TO LASTING PEACE

By

DAVID STARR JORDAN

INDIANAPOLIS
THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

COPYRIGHT 1916
THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY

PRESS OF
BRAUNWORTH & CO.
BOOKBINDERS AND PRINTERS
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

I can not help thinking of you as ye deserve, O ye governments.—THOREAU.

Wrong is never so weak as in its hour of triumph.—THOMAS BRACKETT REED.

PREFATORY NOTE

This little book contains the address of the President of the World's Peace Congress given on October 10, 1915, in the Greek Theater at Berkeley, California, at the session held in connection with the International Panama-Pacific Exposition. To this address as delivered certain additions have been made in order to bring the matter contained up to the date of publication.

It is an effort to summarize the most important of the various propositions which have been made during the Great War to secure Lasting Peace at the end of the conflict.

I express my continuous obligation to my wife, Jessie Knight Jordan, for help both critical and constructive. I am also indebted to my kinsman, Professor Harvey Ernest Jordan, of the University of Virginia, for a critical reading of proof-sheets.

It is fair to recall the words of Doctor Alfred H. Fried to the effect that peace-workers are not firemen called in to put out a fire which was not of their setting. They are rather agents of fire-proof material for construction which if generally used would make conflagration impossible.

D. S. J.

Stanford University
October 23, 1915

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	THE PRESENT CRISIS	1
	The Struggle of the Twentieth Century	2
	The Three Meanings of Peace	3
	The Prospect of Universal Defeat	6
	Motives of the War	7
	The Reaction Against Democracy	7
II	DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF WAR	16
	Analysis of Propositions for Lasting Peace	16
	The Union of Democratic Control	20
	The Committee of Switzerland	28
	Social Democracy of South Germany	30
	World Peace Foundation	37
	The International Bureau of Peace	40
	The World Map	45
	The Socialists of America	46
	The Socialists of Northern Europe	51
	The Socialists of the Allied Nations	52
	The Independent Labour Party	52
	Social Democrats of Austria and Hungary	54
	Social Democrats of Germany	55
	The British Friends	59
	The League to Limit Armaments	61
	The Anti-War Council of Holland	63
	The New York Peace Society	77
	The World Union	77
	A League of Peace	78
	The Foundations of a League of Peace	79
	The League to Enforce Peace	107
	The League's Proposals	110
	A Congress of Neutrals proposed in the Pan-American Union	121
	The Commission of Inquiry	125

CONTENTS—*Continued*

CHAPTER		PAGE
III	WOMEN AND WAR	129
	The Woman's Peace Party	129
	The Women of Norway	132
	The Women's Congress at Berne	132
	Mediation without Armistice	133
	The Mediatory Commission of Neutrals	138
	The International Committee of Women	145
	Constructive Peace	156
	The School Peace League	157
IV	RESOLUTIONS OF CONGRESSES	158
	National Education Association	158
	International Peace Congress	161
	The Peace Alliance of Australia	170
	The Japanese Peace Society	171
	The International Union of Ethical Societies	171
	The European Federation for Peace	172
V	PEACE MANIFESTOES	173
	The Church and Peace	173
	The New Union of the Fatherland	180
	Prevention of War	181
	The Pope's Appeal for Peace	187
VI	INDIVIDUALS AND PEACE	193
	Basis of Peace in Europe	193
	Plan to End War	194
	Enduring Peace	195
	The Seizure of Colonies	197
	International Government	202
	Restoration of Europe	203
	The Great Settlement	203
	Future of World Peace	204
	Social Progress	204

CONTENTS—*Continued*

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Insurance and War	204
	After War, What?	204
	A Peace Proposal	209
	Interests of Neutral Nations	210
	Interchangeable Citizenship	210
	The American Institute in Belgium	211
	Fundamentals of Peace	213
	Science in Personal and National Right	216
	Changes in the Map	220
	A World-City of Civilization	222
VII	The Case Against War	226
	The Peace that Shall Last	226
VIII	World Federation	243
	The Federation of Europe	243
	Utopia or Hell	247
	The Passing of Nationalism	249
	Appendix	252
	The Peace Pilgrimage	252

WAYS TO LASTING PEACE

WAYS TO LASTING PEACE

CHAPTER I

THE PRESENT CRISIS

ALL over the world in these days most serious thought is being devoted to the question of lasting peace. Some thirty separate plans for the organization of Europe in the interest of law and order have been put forth by societies of standing and authority, and still others equally important by individual men. It is a very hopeful sign that so many persons are planning terms of peace, outlines of federations, schemes of international reorganization, all looking forward to some sort of rational settlement which will make future wars as preposterous as they are wanton and murderous. The chief purpose of this book is to present the gist of these proposals and to attempt an interpretive analysis. The end desired is to furnish material for thoughtful consideration.

The Struggle of the Twentieth Century

At the end of the war we shall have without doubt the greatest intellectual and political struggle since the Reformation. On the one hand will be those who hope to continue the old war system with its extravagant expenditures and vast bodies of officers with their conscript serfs. On the other will be those who wish to bring Europe into some sort of federation in which armaments will be reduced and individual states will cooperate, instead of tormenting and defying one another.

To continue the old régime on the old basis will be impossible. The war system has fallen by its own weight. The amount expended on armaments before the war, upward of ten million dollars a day, will be altogether beyond the resources of the people who do the paying. The war debt of Europe, already monstrous—about twenty-eight billion dollars in all—has nearly doubled within the year, and on top of it has come the expenditure of the war, including the waste of cities and property, which has reached already the stupendous figure of more

than forty-five thousand millions of dollars, a sum apparently greater than the entire farm values of all the United States. The impoverishment in money and in manhood has carried Europe back toward the condition of utter collapse produced by the religious wars succeeding the Reformation. The nations are much richer now than they were then, thanks to the years of security and relative peace, but the cost of making war has increased in these modern days far more rapidly than the national wealth.

It is certain that the treaty of peace will not settle all of the problems that the war has raised and emphasized. It may not settle any of them. In any event the young men of Europe and America have resting on their shoulders the most important duty of many centuries—the duty of bringing freedom to the suppressed people of a continent, and lasting security to a crippled world.

The Three Meanings of "Peace"

We may note that in current usage the word "peace" has three different meanings, as suggested

by Alfred H. Fried. These we may describe as the peace of contentment, the armed peace and the peace of constructive action.

The peace of contentment finds its ideal in intellectual and physical repose, the absence of discordant factors and the harmony of life. It is the peace of a Corot landscape, of running brooks, green thickets and meadows carpeted with flowers. It would permit a happy existence to "mollycoddles," as well as to the "red coat bully in his boots," of whom Thackeray speaks. Its essence is peace of mind, the absence of "fierce unrest and sordid, low ambition," the "old peace with velvet-sandalled feet" of the Japanese poet. Its symbol in animal life is appropriately found in the dove.

The armed peace is a condition of balanced hate, the peace which comes with the cessation of war, while the war spirit endures. In its nature this has more of war than peace, for its atmosphere is fear and hate, and its purpose to get ready for further mutual destruction. In the phrase of William James, this form of peace finds in war its "verification." By its results we may be sure of its

purpose. Professor Grant Showerman finds actual war and armed peace male and female of the same species. As the fitting symbol of armed peace, the lion and the eagle have been long accepted. But these animals have no adequate equipment of diplomacy. More fitting, it would seem, would be the figure of the waiting hyena, for the armed peace, as Pierre Loti has suggested, rests on the "hyena theory of nations."

Real peace is found in the permanence of law, and the value of law lies in the opportunity it gives for constructive progress. Peace is reality in human history, while war is the ruinous negation. Peace is the period in which constructive acts become possible, the establishment of freedom and justice, of education and sanitation, of commerce and industry, of the removal of barriers and the spanning of continents, the saving of life and the exaltation of spirit, of the discipline of self-restraint and the virtue of helpfulness. For an animal symbol for constructive peace we should seek, not the innocence of the dove, but some more powerful creature which represents intelligent and

watchful helpfulness—the St. Bernard dog, for example.

The Prospect of Universal Defeat

To bring the great war to a close by any method is one of the most difficult processes of which we can conceive. To all appearances both sides are defeated. Unless some unforeseen element appears, the great war must end in a drawn game. When this fact is realized the ministries of the nations deemed aggressors will have a hard task to reckon with their own people. The sacrifice without parallel of some eight millions of men and women, of some forty-five billions of dollars' worth of property, and the permanent depletion of the breed of men will be charged to the gray old strategists, the war-at-any-price aristocracy of Europe and to their associated diplomatists. A great revulsion of feeling must ensue. Whether this revulsion at the end makes for reaction and tyranny or for democracy and betterment only time can tell. There are powerful interests in all nations tending in either direction, and the political lines of the next half-

century will be drawn on the question of militarism versus civilism.

Motives of the War

Of the many motives behind the great war, we must recognize that economic motives and motives of international distrust, envy or hate take but a secondary place. These are brought forward as excuses or justifications or weapons in argument, but surely no nation on account of these would have ventured to break the peace of the world.

The Reaction Against Democracy

In my judgment the primal motive behind the great war was largely internal and political. It is part of the age-long struggle against privilege. One by one the nations of Europe have taken away the perquisites of the classes that rule by inherited right. Little by little in every nation liberty and democracy have encroached on privilege and aristocracy. In every country "freedom slowly broadens down from precedent to precedent," and as freedom broadens the scope of aristocracy must narrow.

The spectacle of an "emperor without an empire" has been increasingly painful to the military aristocracy of Germany. The spectacle of an impotent House of Lords in Great Britain has been a source of alarm wherever lords of any kind assemble.

Throughout the ages war has been the sport of kings, a hellish amusement designed primarily to keep down the populace and to divert their attention from the abuses of aristocracy. "War presents a sharp medicine for internal disunion, or waning patriotism. . . . The war with France [in 1870] was," continues Professor Treitschke, "for Germany, indeed, a blessed necessity. . . . The call to arms dashed all parties into fragments. It has uplifted the hearts of all good patriots. They feel as if they were engaged in a holy war, a war for the liberation of the world."

In this Treitschke was quite right. In every international war all efforts at reform are submerged, all possibility of consideration of right and wrong is lost, and all members of a nation meet on the common ground of national defense and the patriotism of hate. My fatherland, right or wrong,

becomes the motto, and the nation which suppresses the criticism of its best sons and daughters sooner or later wakes to find itself very much in the wrong.

"No war," says Clara Grunsky, "can present a clear issue between right and wrong. Clear as his principles may shine before him, the man who goes to war in the name of right, if he will but lift his eyes, will see that it is not the wrong he is fighting, but his fellow men."

Moreover, the men who make this discovery are silent. Every war is a "brawl in the dark," and the men thrown into the slaughter can not be heard. "It is because all the young men," says George M. Trevelyan, "are drafted into the army the moment there is any sign of trouble, that there can be no revolution attempted in any part of Europe to-day. The modern militant organization makes revolution impossible."

The fact that every year of peace marks in every country a stage in the slow evolution from militarism to civilism, from privilege to liberty, from oligarchy to democracy, has thrown the tendency to revolution on the other side.

Almost every war in modern times revolves around a conspiracy of the privileged classes to revive their waning power. The army is the right arm of the aristocracy, as the state church is the left arm. The gray old strategists who look to war to keep their names alive are the ready allies of privilege, and the young men are their sacrifice. In a large sense, very few wars are international; men of all types of moral excellence are perforce on each side. Each side has its own war-makers, and these play into one another's hands. The real struggle is within the nation. The rebellion in Ulster had its roots, not in Ulster, but in Westminster, in the aristocratic revulsion against the Parliament act. And the real reason for the war in Europe is that the democracies, while correcting abuse after abuse of their former rulers, have left to the kings and the nobility the one function of control of war-making power. With these they have played unguarded, as boys sometimes play with fireworks, and the result is the destruction, more or less complete, of the whole social system of Europe.

I do not propose here to discuss the relative guilt of these nations for the crime of world war. Each one must frame his own judgment of approval or condemnation. But we must not forget that in each nation a certain class welcomed war because there was a strong hope that one result of the war would be a powerful reaction against democracy in national affairs. "Universal service which has resulted in such subservience to the landed interests in Prussia would be an effective bulwark in England against the rising tide of democracy and the new tendencies toward social unrest and equalitarianism. If the war and the alarms to which it has given rise leave behind a militant state, it is felt that it would not have been in vain. . . . A nation in arms would make its defense [the House of Lords] invulnerable."*

In like vein a young German nobleman, "Karl von H—," writes:† "When one thinks how difficult it was for H. [Heydebrand?] to convince our Emperor that the last moment had arrived for giv-

* Quoted by Alfred G. Gardiner, *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1915.

† *The Adverul*, Bucharest, August 21, 1915.

ing free course to the war, otherwise pacificism, internationalism, anti-militarism and the rest of the noxious plants of our century would be propagated to such a point that even our stupid people *(der dumme Michel)* would come to be infected with these maladies. That would have been the finish, the twilight of our glowing nobility. We can lose nothing by the war. On the contrary, we have everything to gain. We can never sufficiently thank our Emperor for having saved the German nobility from such a fate. Even if the result of the war be uncertain, we would have nothing to lose, for the people would never rise against us.

"We are going to be the absolute masters of the world. All the chimeras and stupidities, like democracy, will be chased out of the universe for an infinite time. We are already rid of Bebel. We shall soon be rid of that headstrong fellow who calls himself Harden and of all the fools who have the pretense to impose on us their theories. That we may finish with all these charlatans we must first become the all-powerful dictators of the world. . . . At last, we have to purge our country of all its

revolutionary ideas that our nobility may recover its ancient splendor, its power and its authority."

This letter, if authentic, as it seems to be, must not be taken as typically German any more than the sentiments quoted earlier are typically British. Both are characteristic of a large section of the advocates of war in any nation. And it is this class primarily, the war-at-any-cost people, among whom the movements for lasting peace find their principal opponents.

A German officer, wounded, in a hospital in Lorraine, writes me thus:

"You will easily know my view now, when I tell you that you were wholly right in what you say in *What Shall We Say?* of January 19, 1915 . . . especially the last two paragraphs contain all that I would say and prove by many details."

The paragraphs referred to read as follows:

"If we want peace we must prepare for it, guarding it at every angle, and reducing, so far as we can, all war's incentives. When nations are armed, a very few men, a very small accident may turn the scale. To lose at one point is to lose at all. It

is the armament itself which is the true cause of war. Trade jealousies, race antipathies, land hungers—all these are mere excuses, which would not of themselves lead any nation to fight. It takes a vigorous agitation, war scares and war appeals and unlimited lying to get these taken seriously.

"The safeguard for peace is the minimum, not the maximum of armament. As to this, Washington—who warned us so sagaciously against entangling alliances—had also this word of caution: 'Overgrown military establishments are, under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as peculiarly hostile to republican liberty.' "

It was said before our Civil War that the union of the states could "not endure half-slave, half-free." In like fashion, the peace of Europe can not endure half-slave, half-free, half the people with ideals of liberty and of duty based on the stern command, the "Categorical Imperative" of the individual conscience, and half with ideals of comfortable subservience and of duty based on the com-

mand of rulers whom they have not chosen and for whom they have only a passive responsibility.

In the days of Cromwell, Pym, Hampden, Washington, Mirabeau and Carl Schurz, the inevitable conflict worked itself out in civil war, the democracy rising against its oppressors. In our day, when aristocracy is better entrenched and democracy more powerful, the conflict is turned into the side issue of international war, a conflict without visible causes, which the oligarchy may direct while the democracy pays and dies.

And after the killing is finished the controversy must blaze forth, more fiercely than ever. But its final settlement must rest in the slow growth of law, not in any single victory, either of arms or of the ballot.

CHAPTER II

DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF WAR

Analysis of Propositions for Lasting Peace

ALL of the intelligent constructive propositions thus far proposed, with others crowding to the front in almost every nation, practically agree in essential demands.

They unite in the petition for democratic control of government action; for the use of law instead of force in the adjustment of international disputes —though most of them agree that a degree of force, police rather than military, should stand behind the world court as a support or sanction. They demand the interposition of difficulties in the way of declarations of war, taking these out of the hands of any single man or any small group acting in secret.

All have the demand for a congress of peoples, instead of that gathering of non-representative diplomats known as the "Concert of the Powers."

They call, not only for a permanent court of arbitration, but also for a permanent council for the investigation of facts in international differences. The principle of the admirable "Cooling Off Treaties," as negotiated by Mr. Bryan, would be made a matter of general application.

Most of them ask for the revival and strengthening of The Hague conferences.

All ask for disarmament to some degree, and most of them for the national ownership of armament manufacturing plants, and the abolition of private profits in armament making.

Most of them call for immunity of private property at sea and the relief of commerce and passenger traffic from attack in time of war.

Most ask for international neutralization of the channels of commerce, some for the neutralization of coaling stations also.

Most of them deny "the right of conquest" and ask that no arbitrary changes of boundary be made without the consent of the people immediately affected.

Most call for the abolition of secret diplomacy,

and for adequate safeguards against the possibility of war by a small group of men.

Most of them call for equality of race, religion and language within the nation.

Some ask for the exclusion of military education from the lower schools. It may here be noted that militaristic Prussia has never allowed military instruction to intrude into any schools not military.

Some ask for universal suffrage for women as well as men; others for the better recognition of manhood suffrage.

Some of them ask for a definition of the duty of a nation in relation to the exploitation of backward regions. Exploiters should take their own chances; or, at the most, only open enterprises, the details of which are public property, should receive the support of the nation concerned.

Most favor the elimination of the economic causes of war, whether such are real causes or merely excuses framed for the purpose of increase of armament.

Those who refer to indemnities are opposed to them under all circumstances as of the nature

of highway robbery. Those who have discussed any immediate steps favor the federation of all peace forces, and the calling as soon as practicable of some conference in permanent session to use its influence toward stopping the war.

All look forward to social justice, constructive action and the development of the will to peace.

None of these favors a world parliament except as concerning the broadest international questions, as local self-government is in itself one of the best pledges of peace. All favor in one way or another the extension of the principle of democracy but none would approve of attempts to introduce democratic forms prematurely or by force. It is assumed that world law will rise from the precedents set by the international tribunal rather than from any direct action of a world law-making body.

In general, all seem to realize that militarism will not put an end to militarism, and that the reduction of the military control must lie with the people themselves. They assume that the people are a more potent as well as a more rational force in public affairs than armies and navies.

In this book I shall consider briefly the principal constructive plans for the permanence of law and security thus far proposed. These I shall treat mainly in order of time. The order of importance only the future may determine.

The Union of Democratic Control

The oldest of these is the Union of Democratic Control, formed in London in September, 1914, the leading spirits being Norman Angell, author of *The Great Illusion;* Arthur Ponsonby, author of *The Decline of Aristocracy;* E. D. Morel, author of *Red Rubber,* an exposition of atrocities in South America; J. Ramsey Macdonald, a labor leader; Honorable Lady Emmett Barlow, active in liberal reforms; Henry Noel Brailsford, author of *The War of Steel and Gold;* John A. Hobson, author of *Imperialism;* Israel Zangwill, author of *The War God* and *The Melting Pot.* With these, many other well-known public men are associated.

This union, as its name indicates, strikes first and directly at the primal cause of war, the use of petty rivalries as an excuse for international strife.

It protests against the political crime of leaving in the hands of a very few men the power of declaring war, to bring ruin to a continent.

In the articles of union of the Union of Democratic Control is the following clause:

"The foreign policy of Great Britain shall not be aimed at creating alliances for the purpose of maintaining the 'balance of power,' but shall be directed to the establishment of a Concert of the Powers, and the setting up of an International Council, whose deliberations and decisions shall be public; part of the labor of such council to be the creation of definite treaties of arbitration and the establishment of courts for their interpretation and enforcement."

How this enforcement should be carried out is not stated. It points toward some form of international police, wholly subject to civil authority. As, however, out of about four hundred cases of arbitration no nation has repudiated a decision, it is not very likely that the use of force would ever be found actually necessary in this connection.

Another clause looks toward the drastic reduc-

tion, by general consent, of the armaments of all the belligerent powers. This is supposed to follow naturally on democratic control of the European governments.

The success of this plan involves leadership on the part of those who realize that the old war system can not stand any longer, and who believe that the "armed peace" must give way to a rational and more friendly system of adjustment.

A further demand is for the nationalization of the manufacture of armament and the national control of all exports of armament.

The purpose of this is to destroy the influence of the most powerful trust the world has ever known—the "War Traders" of Europe. These nine leading companies, with their tentacles and parasites, controlled the armament trade of Europe. And their frequent partnerships showed a truly fine international spirit, knowing no race antipathy, rising grandly above all squabbles and above that jealousy between nations in the creation of which they themselves had taken a leading part.

For they have had, in each country, "Army

Leagues," "Navy Leagues" and subsidized newspapers, all acting together in the promotion of the one thing for which the companies mainly existed —the distribution of that ten million dollars spent every day in Europe for instruments of destruction, piled up in the name of peace as an insurance against war. And in large part as the result of this costly insurance, Europe undergoes the most ruinous war this quarrelsome world has ever known!

It will not be an easy thing to buy out these people, either by agreement or by condemnation. It would very likely be quite as easy to abolish war as to get rid of them. They have amazing resources in the swaying of governmental action, for they are indeed part of the administration. It is not easy for a government to suppress a concern in which its own leading members are stockholders.

It is, of course, possible in theory for the governments to set up rival plants and force those in existence to devote themselves to making plowshares and merchant ships. But it would be a very bold ministry that would attempt this.

And yet the stress of war has forced something

like this on Great Britain. The government has taken possession of these plants as it has of the railroads, as a war necessity, guaranteeing a reasonable or rather a large profit to the stockholders, but controlling and managing the factories in its own interest. Martial law now prevails everywhere in Europe, and martial law, being no law at all, allows to the government almost any exercise of force which the emergencies of war seem to justify. People will patiently endure anything in the way of governmental usurpation as long as their boys are under fire in the trenches.

The Union of Democratic Control insists most firmly that in Great Britain, in the future, no treaty or understanding should be made to bind the nation or its officials in any way, until ratified by the action of Parliament. This resolution is directed against the secret treaty and against all agreements, understandings or conventions between the Foreign Office and representatives of other nations, not openly and freely discussed in Parliament.

The secret treaty is an instrument for quick

work in emergencies. It is a cherished tool of a "vigorous foreign policy," by which autocratic nations convert internal disagreements into external crises. An autocratic or militant government needs to cover its acts with secrecy, its power lying largely in its capacity to strike sudden blows. But a democracy can not use these weapons effectively nor safely.

The resolution of the Union of Democratic Control is suggested especially by the experience of the Triple Entente, which has entangled Great Britain in military adventures more or less unforeseen and certainly quite undesired.

This "Entente," or understanding, between Great Britain, France and Russia was developed in 1904 and 1905, after the clash between British and French interests at Fashoda in the Sudan. It was primarily the work of the French minister, Théophile Delcassé, and his purpose was the protection of France against the apparently growing chauvinism of the militarists of Germany. The details of this understanding were not made public, a fact which gave rise to continuous and severe criticism

of the conduct of the Foreign Office, on the part of a large section of the British people. There was no serious question as to the ability or the honesty of Sir Edward Grey, but a foreign office whose operations were "hermetically sealed" and not made public was not acceptable to British democracy. The British people were for the most part very strongly opposed to military service on the continent and the furthest limit to which they could be drawn in that direction apparently was, in the words of E. D. Morel, that of "*sanctioning the defense of France, if wantonly attacked by Germany on an issue affecting those two countries alone.*"

If the British position merits criticism, the real ground for this is to be found in the fact that its government allowed itself to be placed in a position in which war was the sole means left by which to save a friendly neighbor. Morel throws the blame for this condition on secret diplomacy. He says: "The blood of our gallant sons is poured out to-day as the immediate consequence of the outrage upon Belgium. But the time will come when

the country will ask of those in authority this question, 'What did you do to prevent this outrage?' For my part, I put that question now, and I find the answer in autocratic and secret policy to which I have been consistently opposed and which I intend to help in rooting out of our nation." (*The Outbreak of the War*, October 14, 1914.)

The Union of Democratic Control expressly denies all forms of the "right of conquest." It insists that no province, conquered or not, shall be transferred from one government to another without the affirmative vote of its population.

This is fair in principle, but its application involves many difficulties. After a war the population of a conquered province is likely to be in utter confusion. The people might find it dangerous to vote with a minority in opposition to the dominant forces. The shadow of the conqueror's power would be dark over the polls, especially when, as in Prussia, the vote* must be expressed aloud and distinctly. Besides the decision as to the nation preferred does not tell the whole story. The real

* See page 35.

problem is that of the final status of the province within the nation to which it is attached. In Alsace-Lorraine, for example, the immediate grievance in recent years was not that the province was attached to Germany but that the people were "second-class Germans," not full citizens with full rights of self-government within the Empire.

The Committee of Switzerland

The Swiss Committee for the Study of the Principles of a Durable Treaty of Peace, Doctor Otfried Nippold, late of Frankfort, President, has published a memorial setting forth these principles.

This committee, established in August, 1914, almost simultaneously with the League of Democratic Control, began its studies on the following statement:

"The Treaty of Peace which ultimately will follow this devastating war should contain the fundamental elements of the new era, an era which should guarantee to the peace-loving peoples of the world the impossibility of a subsequent European conflict. No work is more important, no activity more imper-

ative, than that of bringing proper influence to bear upon public opinion and upon the different governments to the end that this goal may be reached." In this excellent memorial is an illuminating discussion of various topics, notably the following:

The participation of the law-abiding or non-belligerent countries in the negotiations of the Treaty of Peace, the question of political alliances, their dangers, their possible advantages, the cession of territories or colonies, the question of an understanding concerning armaments, the consolidation of international rule and basis of law by means of mutual guarantees and of international conventions, the extension of international law by means of the organization of mediation, commissions of inquiry, arbitration and permanent jurisdiction, the neutralization of states and territories, the extension of the right of neutrality and especially of the right of traffic* of neutrals in time of war,

* "There can not be sufficient stress laid on the fact that the first and most important law of neutrality lies in that the belligerents ought to take the greatest care in respecting the rights of neutrals as they have quite enough to suffer from the war."—Hans Wehberg (*See-Kriegsrecht*).

free trade in the colonies. All that we can hope for from the treaty of peace, all that the future of Europe can bring us in the way of blessing may be summed up in these words:

"In future Might before Right may no longer be the order of the day, but the path must be cleared more and more for the domination of Right. If, in History there has ever been a moment in which one could work for the attainment of this lofty aim with success, it will be on the day on which the Peace Congress assembles with the intention of putting an end to the European war and of ushering in a new era in Europe."

Social Democracy of South Germany

The Social Democrats of South Germany have tried to formulate a basis for lasting peace. Under the burden of militarism and during actual war, they move with difficulty, though they show a clear vision as to the ends to be achieved. They give as their ultimate aim a confederation of all European states.

This would raise each state from the position

of a "power" to that of a jurisdiction. In time they would form the "United States of Europe" on terms resembling those of the United States of America, but doubtless at first with a larger insistence upon states' rights than the American commonwealths have retained.

These Social Democrats demand the alliance of all peaceful states against aggressors, hoping at the same time that all members of the federation would remain alike peaceful. They desire an international parliament, and a permanent international commission to take the place at present held by diplomacy.

The beginning of such an international parliament was made more than forty years ago by the establishment, through the efforts of Frédéric Passy and others, of the Interparliamentary Union, which has met every year until the present. However, this union has had no authority to enforce obedience in matters of importance. The international parliament as contemplated by these German Socialists would have the power to frame international statutes and to uphold them by force if necessary.

If such power were granted it should be closely limited to measures of international security. The principle of "home rule" is vitally important with people of varying manners and customs.

Another demand is that all minor international offenses should come regularly before an international law court. This in effect would make of the Tribunal of The Hague a body in permanent session, not as at present one to be called together only for the settlement of specific cases. The Social Democrats' plan also has a clause demanding that a people's army, the *Volksheer*, be established, and that this and the people's navies should be used only for defense against aggressors. This would rule out the most dangerous of all kinds of aggression—that masquerading under the name of defense. One of the most common devices to bring on war is the preventive attack, justified as a necessity to strike first in order to forestall an attack by the enemy. They ask for an international police to guard the borders as the national police maintain peace in internal affairs. The difference between a police and an army is this: the

police is absolutely subject to the civil authority while the army in action knows no outside control.

In the interests of commerce and justice the German Social Democrats demand the international possession and control of all the narrow channels and canals through which the world's trade must pass. They enumerate, as such channels, the Bosporus, the Dardanelles, the Straits of Gibraltar and the Suez and the Kiel Canals.

They ask either that every nation should resume, at the end of the war, its former territory, or that if any changes are to be made in boundaries as the result of the war, then that the people of the district affected should vote as to the nation with which they wish to cast their lot.

The districts mentioned in this connection are Alsace, Lorraine—enumerated separately—Schleswig, Poland, the Baltic provinces of Russia, Finland, and the Trentino, the latter being one of the three "unredeemed provinces" of Italy, now under Austrian rule. The other portions of "Italia Irredenta," Trieste and Istria, are not mentioned.

In all governments, the plan continues, there

should be a guarantee of democratic control, including equality in population of all voting districts, with a redistricting every ten years. Proportional representation and the payment of all members of assemblies are also asked for.

These demands are intended to correct the extraordinary conditions which prevail in Prussia. In the Prussian Landtag, for instance, the deputies are chosen by immediate electors or *Wahlmänner*. These are voted for directly but under circumstances that prevent the people at large from ever coming into control. Of these *Wahlmänner*, one-third are chosen by the people who pay the first third of the taxes, one-third by those who pay the second third of the taxes, and the remaining third by the people at large. In the city of Neustadt, in Silesia, for example, a single wealthy manufacturer chooses one-third of the whole Board of Electors (which body is in turn to name all the deputies to the Landtag), his partner and another rich man together choose the second third, leaving only the final third to be chosen by the people at large —that is, some twenty-five thousand individuals.

These, even by voting together unanimously, can never control more than one-third of the Board of Electors and none whatever of the chosen delegates. Usually the first and second groups are composed of the nobility and wealthy financiers or industrialists. These ordinarily caucus together, insuring under all circumstances a clear two-thirds majority for the conservative group. It is said* that in Prussia at large, the first class controls about two hundred thousand votes, the second nine hundred thousand, the third over six million.

Besides all this there has been no readjustment of electoral districts in forty years or more, and a great many large centers of population, which are also centers of unrest, have no more representation than a country village. "The Prussian parliament is necessarily devoted to agrarian interests and tends sadly to neglect the just claims of the 23,000,000 Prussians who constitute the industrial population."† Moreover every voter must cast his vote orally and loud—"*mündlich und*

* Charles Tower: *Germany of To-day.*
† *Ibid.*

klar," the law reads—there you have the outlines of the situation which the German Socialists have a reasonable desire to correct. This plan was described by Bismarck himself as "the wretchedest of all systems," although it is acceptable to the Junker group of Eastern Prussia.

Baden, "the model duchy," has the secret ballot and manhood suffrage—one man, one vote.

In the imperial Reichstag of Germany ordinary manhood suffrage exists. But here again there has been no redistricting; and the Reichstag itself has no real authority, being a "debating society" with no actual control over the policies of the Empire or over the action or the personnel of the imperial ministry. Should it refuse to vote appropriation of funds the assignment of the previous year holds.

The payment of members of legislative bodies would make it possible for the representatives of labor to take a more active part in government affairs.

In addition, the Social Democrats urge that at the end of the war no indemnity whatever shall be

asked or given. One of the greatest evils of modern warfare is this, that, following the example of Bismarck, who vainly attempted, as he said, to "bleed France white," the nations have hoped to replenish their coffers by forced indemnity—in other words, by highway robbery.

With the Social Democrats, as with the Union of Democratic Control in England, no immediate action is urged, because each group recognizes that there is no visible way of bringing to bear any influence toward an immediate ending of the war. "Our purpose," says a member of this group, Clara Zetkin, of Stuttgart, "is Peace, lasting Peace, and therewith no violation of the dignity or independence of any nation. No annexation, no humiliating conditions. . . . Leave the world free for the fraternity of the people and for their co-operation in bringing to flower the culture of international civilization."

World Peace Foundation

The next constructive program, in order of time, and probably the first of all to be actually printed, is that of the World Peace Foundation, founded

by the late Edward Ginn, with headquarters in Boston. This statement, written by Professor Charles H. Levermore, was modified and extended by a committee consisting of Edwin D. Mead, Hamilton Holt, James A. Macdonald, Charles R. Brown, Joseph Swain, George W. Nasmyth, Albert G. Bryant and the writer.

This plan calls for a European Concert, with a representative council, in place of entangling alliances and ententes.

With the present machinery of diplomacy, at The Hague conference and elsewhere, it is very difficult to secure representatives who will deal with one another sincerely and in the real interests of the peace of Europe. The failure of the Concert of the Powers was glaringly evident in the Treaty of London and other incidents of the Balkan war. The compromises it reached satisfied nobody and the establishment of Albania as a separate kingdom under a German prince brought on at once the second Balkan war.

The Foundation asks for a drastic reduction of armament, for the end of the military rivalry be-

tween nations, and for the nationalization of the manufacture of armament.

If nations must make war or must defend themselves by national action, they should in the same fashion make their own machinery of defense; either making war an exclusive function of government, or else, as in the Middle Ages, turning the whole business, fighting and all, over to private enterprise. It might cost more, even much more, for the government to manufacture its own armament, but it would rid itself of a cancerous growth of armament speculation.

It asks also for an international police to protect all the nations alike from outlaws and from pirates; and that no territory shall be transferred without the consent of its people. It demands the open and democratic control of treaties and of foreign policies. It urges that citizens of neutral nations be not allowed to make loans to belligerents.

The Foundation suggests no steps for immediate action, for at the time it was not possible to devise any way of reaching the war-making authorities in the leading nations. All that can be done as yet

is to declare a stand in opposition to war and in favor of fair play and democratic control. These views may reach Europe through private letters, through resolutions and through the press. For the present America's actions must be wholly opportunist, keeping out of the fight herself, reducing enmities so far as it is possible, and opposing any line of action which looks toward the right of conquest or toward the humiliation or dismemberment of any of the nations concerned in the war. This latter may not apply to Turkey, who has long since outworn her rights in Europe.

The International Bureau of Peace

The *Bureau International de la Paix*, at Berne, of which Senator Henri La Fontaine, of Brussels, is president, has developed a program as to the reconstruction of Europe.

This demands that all the nations of Europe should take part in the final treaty of peace; that the third Hague Conference, which was due in 1915, be called immediately after peace is made, and

that a joint tribunal be established on a juridical basis, supported by all the states collectively.

A juridical basis, or basis of law, is a little different from that on which some of The Hague decisions have been rendered. In a tribunal which does not cross-examine, there is always a tendency to split the difference between the claims of the contending parties. There have been cases brought before arbitration tribunals in which one side had no merit, but had hoped to gain something nevertheless through this system of splitting the difference. Against the practise is the obvious objection that sometimes one side in a dispute is wholly right and the other wholly wrong; and this is the significance of the demand for a tribunal which shall consider questions of law and equity only, without relation to matters of expedience.

The former Hague Conferences have worked under this handicap, that nearly half the delegates were really opposed to international understandings, and were actually working secretly in behalf of the war system. Most of the delegations from

the various states voted under the "unit rule," which put the constructive members at the mercy of the reactionaries. The "unit rule" is the agreement by which the representatives from one nation shall vote as one on all questions.

The Berne Bureau asks specifically that the number of soldiers in each nation be reduced to the number necessary to maintain internal order as police; and this number is estimated at one soldier for every one thousand people. This would allow Great Britain about forty-five thousand soldiers, Germany sixty-five thousand, while the United States on these terms could add about ten thousand to the present standing army.

The Bureau asks further that all war navies be abolished, and that all fortifications be dismantled; and that no armament shall be created except for an international navy and international army; and that this manufacture should all be done in one factory under an international commission. The navy should be used for police purposes mainly, operating for the most part in waters likely to be infested with pirates.

It asks that the people of every territory should have the right to decide upon their own national destiny; also for the abolition of secret diplomacy; for the maintenance in each nation of a committee of the parliament, which shall be continually in touch with all foreign nations; and with most of the other constructive peace plans for democratic control of all foreign policy.

Strictly speaking, however, a democracy ought never to have what is considered a vigorous foreign policy. Democracy is a form of government especially designed for minding its own business. In almost every case the interference of one government with the internal affairs of another has led to some form of disaster.

Further it asks for a penal law against the stirring up of international hatred by the press or by speech. This, of course, could be construed so as to interfere with the liberty of the press and free speech, and in the long run it would be a weapon which would react against the workers for international understanding. The freedom of the press is so vitally important that it is better to overlook its

abuses than to restrain its freedom of action. To be sure, the major part of the press of the world is not really free, being controlled by its advertisers or by political pressure on its owners.

But those journals which are really independent and which represent the actual views of men competent to speak have a far greater influence than those known to be subsidized, or to serve as political organs, their "*Marcheroute*," as the Germans call it, being laid out for them by government bureaus.

An instance of this was found before the war in the wide influence of the independent *Frankfürter Zeitung*, the mouthpiece of normal industry, the Socialist *Vorwärts* and the international-minded *Berliner Tageblatt*. The censorship of the press is still a chosen weapon of tyranny, as well as of "military necessity."

The spirit of the Berne Bureau is thus indicated by President La Fontaine and his colleagues:

"The hopes which filled humanity a few years since when the threshold of the Twentieth Century was crossed seem to have been forgotten. Men's thoughts, filled with hatred and bitterness, are bent

on destruction and the ruthless annihilation of everything which but yesterday they considered as the sacred attributes of an advanced epoch. . . . We do not know when this day (of peace) may come, but we do know that come it must. To keep men from forgetting this day is now a task even sublimer than the healing of the wounds caused in battle, and to prepare for this day is the most sacred duty incumbent on mankind in this period of fever and delirium. It is in the power of men to avoid wars, but once war has been let loose it is beyond your power to shorten it. Your only course is to keep aloof from the slough of hate. Humanity must be above nations. You serve your own nation only by serving humanity."

The World Map

An elaborate program of a treaty of peace, with all its details worked out in legal phraseology, and a full discussion of the legal bearing of each clause, has been prepared under the title *La Fin de la Guerre et l'Établissement d'une Carte Mondiale*, by Paul Otlet, a librarian of the kingdom of Bel-

gium and a very close associate of Senator La Fontaine.

Behind this is *L' Union des Associations Internationales,* including the Interparliamentary Union, the Free Trade Congress, Union of Chambers of Commerce, Institute of International Law, with other important and influential groups.

This is the most elaborate document of the kind yet prepared. There have been many other attempts to formulate an ideal treaty of peace, notably by Professor Ludwig Quidde, of Munich, but not so fully worked out as this of Doctor Otlet. It is likely to prove a document of very great value in the long period of final adjustment sure to follow the making of the actual treaty of peace, however hasty or even temporary the latter may be.

The Socialists of America

The American Socialist Party has also promulgated a program of peace. This goes a little further than most of the others. It asks for an international congress, with legislative and admin-

istrative powers. It asks, as do the others, for disarmament, international police of army and navy, the abolition of all private profit in armament making.

With the Social Democrats of Germany, the American Socialists ask for the international ownership and control of all strategic waterways, including, with the Bosporus, Dardanelles, Strait of Gibraltar, Suez and Kiel Canals, the Panama Canal as well.

They demand especially the "neutrality of all the seas," making the open ocean a free and safe highway for the commercial vessels of all nations, in time of war or peace, without regard for nationality. This would limit naval warfare to the territorial waters of the belligerent nations.

This seems to be one of the most vitally important of all the various propositions. There is no rational defense for the process by which a great nation makes war on privately owned merchant ships, passenger ships or fishing craft. If war is to endure, armies should fight against armies and

not against non-combatants. It should cease to crush the enterprise and to endanger the lives of private citizens.

With the others, the American Socialist Party program asks for no unwilling transfer of territory; for abolition of secret diplomacy and the democratic control of foreign policy. Unlike the others, it asks that no declaration of "offensive" warfare shall be made except by the direct vote of the people. It is hard to define "offensive" war. The present war was entered into by all participants on the ground of self-defense, the party striking first gaining an advantage over the other which, it maintained, was also intending to strike. No nation on earth now dares declare openly that it wages any other but defensive warfare or that it ever had any purpose of aggression. Every aggressive war of the last century has been made to appear to the people of each belligerent nation as a war of self-defense.

People under the stress of immediate excitement might vote for war, especially if much is made of stories of vicious aggression; but a few days of

thinking it over would cool any country. The cold-blooded vote would in every nation be overwhelmingly against fighting, if ever a vote on such a subject could be taken in cold blood. It is plain enough that the wars of to-day do not originate in popular movements. But it is also true that a popular movement can be worked up in almost any nation by the groups directly interested. When a great war is actually on it creates a kind of hysteria in the neutral nations. This is felt at present very strongly throughout the law-abiding world, and to a painful extent even in the United States.

The Socialists of America demand universal suffrage, including that of women. It is claimed that it will be impossible to militarize a nation so far advanced as to provide for woman suffrage.

The Socialist party further utters a demand for "industrial democracy" and the elimination thereby of all economic causes of war; the federation of the working classes of the world, the socialization of natural resources and of industries, with the amelioration of working conditions.

With the Socialists of Germany those of America

protest against war indemnities. In history the indemnity as actually levied has with scarcely any exception proved an instrument of injustice. Unlike most of the other peace advocates, the Socialists believe it is possible to act directly and immediately for peace. This is natural because Socialist can speak to Socialist. Each of the belligerent nations has a very large Socialist group; and while fighting in each nation—as they believe in self-defense—they have no sympathy in prolonging the war for purposes of victory or conquest. The American Socialists propose to adopt this program as official; to urge its adoption in every nation; to make a strong proffer of federation with their comrades over the border-lines; and they also ask for the federation with them of all possible peace forces, Socialist or not, in support of a minimum peace program.

This minimum program is not defined. But it might consist in the withdrawal of the German armies from Belgium and France, the stoppage of hostilities, and the co-operative effort to bring about fair play in all disputed matters of territory.

In a later meeting at Chicago, May thirteenth, the Socialist Party declares that "no disaster however appalling, no crime however revolting, justifies the slaughter of nations and the devastation of countries."

To their former demands they add that no Socialist take part in the manufacture of armament, and that all war debts be repudiated. To repudiate war debts would almost disrupt nationality besides creating a new form of suffering with the widest possible ramifications. The bonds of debt-swamped nations in these days are not mainly held by bankers and pawnbrokers. Should repudiation ever come it would be found that widows and orphans were among the chief sufferers. At the time of the French Revolution a large part of the national debt was repudiated to the great distress of many thousands of people who had no part in the extravagance which created the debt.

The Socialists of Northern Europe

The Socialists of Scandinavia and Holland in their convention in Copenhagen follow the general

lines of the other groups, while protesting against the occupation of Belgium and all forms of violent annexation.

The Socialists of the Allied Nations

The Conference of Socialists of the Allied Nations, in London, in February (Arthur Henderson, Secretary) declare themselves not at war with the people of Germany and Austria, but only with the governments by which these countries are oppressed. They declare that the invasion of Belgium and France threatens the very existence of independent nationalities and strikes a blow at all faith in treaties. They protest against all war of conquest and against the policy of colonial dependencies, against aggressive imperialism, and the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalistic society.

The Independent Labour Party

The Independent Labour Party of Great Britain (Francis Johnson, London, Secretary) have a series of demands quite in harmony with those of the Union of Democratic Control, insisting, however,

that the International Arbitration Court should have "power as an alternative to war, to enforce its decisions, by declaring a postal, commercial, transport and financial boycott against any dissenting nation."

As to this we may note that there never has been "a dissenting nation." The determination to make war rests with the professional war makers and with their tools in the diplomatic corps. When a government does not desire war it will submit any case to arbitration, and no arbitral decree is likely to be set aside. Like the payment of interest on bonded indebtedness, it becomes a matter of honor.

Against the policy of the boycott, advocated in many quarters as a substitute for the use of force, General H. G. Otis says, "The introduction of the bad principle of the boycott into international and world affairs would be intolerable because it would be resorting to a vicious, lawless and dangerous method in transactions between nations." A boycott is a sword without a handle which cuts both ways, injuring mainly private interests. It is a weapon not

adapted for democratic government, certainly not easily forged in the United States. It is moreover an interference with personal rights which could not be readily enforced and if maintained for any length of time would become most unpopular. A republic is not a unit to be handled as a single force under executive orders. It is a multifarious group representing every side of every question, the variant forces by common consent neutralized into peaceful toleration of one another.

On the other hand, the boycott or any other form of economic or moral pressure that can be imagined is better than war. In all forms of international difficulty it is never the whole nation which is at fault, but some group, large or small, which for the time controls the nation. It is impossible, as Burke has asserted, "to indict a whole nation."

Social Democrats of Austria and Hungary

The Social Democrats of Austria and Hungary at a meeting in Vienna in April, 1915, agreed on the following principles of a permanent peace:

1. Peace must not mean humiliation of any nation.

2. International arbitration must be made obligatory for the settlement of all disputes between nations.

3. Democratic control of all treaties and international arrangements. (Such control through representatives in legislative assemblies, Reichstag, Parliament, Congress, Storthing, etc.)

4. Limitation of armaments by international agreements as a step toward disarmament.

5. Recognition of the right of self-government of all peoples.

Social Democrats of Germany

To this may be added the following declaration of German Social Democrats in June, 1915:

"This statement (the condemnation of every war of conquest) would become a lie if German Social Democrats, in the face of the present declarations of the ruling classes, restricted themselves to the mere utterance of academical Peace demands. Ex-

perience has proved that not the slightest notice is taken of such demands.

"What many of us feared becomes more and more evident: German Social Democrats are invited to grant the War Credits, but they are coolly ignored when decisions of the greatest importance to the future of our nation are made.

"Can we allow a state of affairs to continue which deprives us of the possibility of making the best possible use of the influence of the German working class on the side of a policy, dictated by our deepest convictions and based on the experience of history, destined to serve the best interests alike of the German nation and of all the nations involved?

"The sacrifices which this war is demanding from the peoples concerned are enormous and increase every day. The history of the world does not record another war which has had even approximately such a murderous effect. It combines the cruelty of barbarous periods with the most refined inventions which civilization has created to sweep away the bloom of the nations. Not less enormous is the sacrifice in materials which the war demands from

the peoples. Vast territories are devastated. Huge sums which governments have refused to spend for social improvement in a year are spent in this war in a week to kill people and to destroy the basis of future welfare. All the nations involved are confronted with bankruptcy if the war is continued.

"In large circles within our own nation and within the nations with whom Germany is at war a strong feeling for peace is more and more uprising. Whilst the governing classes are afraid to comply with this desire for peace, thousands and thousands of people are looking to the Social Democracy, which has always been considered as the principal peace party, and are expecting from it the word of deliverance and action in accordance with such a word.

"As the plans of conquest are laid quite openly before the whole world, Social Democrats have full liberty to assert with the utmost emphasis their antagonism to such plans. And the actual situation makes this liberty a duty. The organized working class expects that all Social Democrats will stand together in full harmony at this juncture, as

they did in a similar situation in 1870, when all Social Democrats united for common action despite their differences at the outset of the war.

"Peace conditions forced from one side upon the enemy nations can not bring a real peace. They can only bring new armaments and the prospect of a new war. A perfect and lasting peace is only possible on the basis of free agreement. It is not within the reach of the Social Democracy of a single country to create this basis, but every party can take its share, according to its strength and position, in creating it.

"The state of affairs at the present moment makes it imperative that German Social Democrats should take a decisive step in realizing this aim. They have the alternative before them of either fulfilling this duty or of striking a mortal blow at the confidence they have up to now possessed in the minds of the German people, and of the people of the whole civilized world, as being the guardians of peace between the nations.

"We have no doubt that our party will prove true to the principles and traditions of its policy

within and outside the Reichstag. The holiest traditions of Social Democracy, as well as the future welfare and liberty of our nation, are at stake. If our party has not yet the power to make national decisions, the task is still ours as a driving force to direct politics toward the goal which we believe to be the right one."

This statement is signed by Eduard Bernstein, Hugo Haase and Karl Kautsky.

The British Friends

The British Society of Friends has adopted resolutions in part as follows:

"We agree with the German Social Democratic Party that a durable peace must be a peace based on the consent of all peoples, and not a peace dictated by conquest. We agree that in the final arrangements national and racial feelings must be fully consulted.

"We heartily indorse Herr Ebert's declaration on behalf of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag, on May 29 (after the intervention of Italy), as quoted and approved in the manifesto:

"'The desire is felt everywhere, and more and more finds expression, that an end should be made at last to the horror of the war. Despite the more difficult situation . . . we believe we ought to voice this longing for peace. In taking this stand we know ourselves to be in agreement with powerful sections of all the nations which are at war with us, who desire with us a peace without violation of the independence of other nations, a peace which makes possible again a lasting co-operation between civilized peoples. Therefore we protest energetically against the attempts which are being made to make peace dependent upon all kinds of conquests. From the beginning we have made it clear that we condemn every war of conquest, and we stand firmly by this.'

"We look for a peace on these terms, and we will reciprocate to the best of our power and strength the efforts of the German Social Democrats to bring our governments together in this spirit.

"In the end the nations must come together. Shall it be after many more days of suffering and

grief, or shall it be to-day, while there still remain the foundations of national happiness and welfare on which to base our hopes for the future?

"Every day the war lasts fresh multitudes of human beings are mutilated and slain. Every day the war lasts hundreds of fresh homes in Belgium, Poland and elsewhere are shattered and destroyed. Every day the war lasts the sum of bitter hatred, frenzied deeds, inhuman degradation, mounts up. Every additional day of war means deeper poverty, greater suffering, more intolerable burdens for the people who remain."

The League to Limit Armaments

The American League to Limit Armaments devotes itself to the one vital work of opposition to the influences moving toward a great increase in military expenditure on the part of the United States. It is organized "to combat militarism and the spread of the militaristic spirit in the United States. It will use its influence to promote a sane national policy for the preservation of interna-

tional law and order with the least reliance upon force, and to secure the efficient use of moneys appropriated for the purpose."

The forces in favor of increase of armament in the law-abiding republic at this moment are mainly three: (a) The operations of the armament makers, with their creatures and tentacles, to the end that their present swollen profits may be indefinitely projected into the future,* (b) the fear shared by very many people that one great nation, having subdued the rest of Europe, may turn her military strength on the United States in hopes of financial recuperation, and the third, (c) the natural desire of those

* The following despatch in the daily press, November 25, 1915, may illustrate this:

"War order profits make a Thanksgiving real among holders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Company stock. Dividends were declared to-day which will give $17,756,260 to holders of the new common stock in real spending money.

"These dividends, an initial quarterly of 1½ per cent. and an extra of 28½ per cent., make the first big cash distribution of the huge profits which the concern is making.

"On October 1 last the old company was taken over by the present company and holders of common stock, of which there was $29,427,100, received a 200 per cent. dividend in common stock of the new corporation, which bought out the old at a valuation of $120,000,000. In this operation 6 per cent. was assured on the old common stock and $58,854,200 new common stock was received. Now this stock gets as a starter 30 per cent. in cash dividends. The stock sold to-day at $450 a share."

concerned with armies and navies to extend the institution they represent. The first element, the ambition of the war traders for future profits, is confined to no one nation. The great questions of the future of Europe must turn on Europe's ability to restrain these activities and to bring its military elements under civil control.

The Anti-War Council of Holland

The *Anti-Oorlogs Raad* (Anti-War Council) of Holland, headed by Doctor B. de Jong van Beek en Donk, has developed an elaborate plan, with committees working to carry it out.

The plan calls for obligatory arbitration and the total abolition of all violence between nations. It advocates the immunity of passenger and freight ships at sea, the extension of free trade and the regulation of competition in exploitation. This organization seems likely to prove an important factor in the security of Europe. This is due to the energy shown in its work, in its nearness to the seat of war, and finally in its provision for a continuous

international commission to be engaged in "watchful waiting" for an opportunity to be heard.

The following is offered as a minimum-program of this society at The Hague:

1. No annexation or transfer of territory shall be made contrary to the interests and wishes of the population concerned. Where possible their consent shall be obtained by plebiscite or otherwise.

The states shall guarantee to the various nationalities included in their boundaries, equality before the law, religious liberty and the free use of their native languages.

2. The states shall agree to introduce in their colonies, protectorates and spheres of influence, liberty of commerce, or at least equal treatment for all nations.

3. The work of The Hague Conference with a view to the peaceful organization of the Society of Nations shall be developed.

The Hague Conference shall be given a permanent organization and meet at regular intervals.

The states shall agree to submit all their disputes to peaceful settlement. For this purpose

there shall be created, in addition to the existent Hague Court of Arbitration, (a) a permanent international Council of Investigation and Conciliation. The states shall bind themselves to take concerted action, diplomatic, economic or military, in case any state should resort to military measures instead of submitting the dispute to judicial decision or to the mediation of the Council of Investigation and Conciliation.

4. The states shall agree to reduce their armaments. In order to facilitate the reduction of naval armaments, the right of capture shall be abolished and the freedom of the seas assured.

5. Foreign policy shall be under the effective control of the parliaments of the respective nations. Secret treaties shall be void.

The organization is ready to co-operate with its colleagues in other law-abiding nations as well as in those which are belligerent.

In a later publication (September, 1915) the Netherland Anti-War Council makes the following statement:

"For a year now war has raged throughout the

world, each new day demanding fresh and horrible sacrifices. Without cessation the warring nations see new troops sent out to strengthen the old reduced forces; everywhere young men are taught how to destroy the greatest number of other young lives. Everywhere dwellings, formerly the abodes of prosperity, happiness and peace, are destroyed by the fire of the enemy—nay, even by the fire of friends—every day families are made homeless and destitute. Millions are spent on this work of destruction, whereas before the war one hundred-thousandth part of the sums now spent could barely be obtained for good works.

"The losses in this war are enormous; they far surpass the gloomiest prophecies about the consequences of a European war, as well with regard to the number of lives lost as to the economical side of the question.

"It is not possible to calculate already how much each of the belligerents has already spent on the war, and what losses the dislocation of traffic and trade has already caused. But a British statistician has made a calculation which may give some

idea of those losses. According to him a year of war would have cost humanity no less than ten milliards of pounds. Can any one realize what that means? It means that the war costs the belligerents over twenty-five million pounds a day; that is a loss of one million pounds per hour.

"And who has foreseen that a European war would destroy so many human lives? Would any one warning the nations against the menace of war have been listened to if he had mentioned figures which, alas, have now already become a reality and which have not yet reached their limit? Even after the war had broken out an Amsterdam professor spoke of the 'Law of the decrease of casualties in war.' Who dares defend that thesis now?

"Our only answer is to repeat the overwhelming figures, not given in fantastic newspaper reports, or by war correspondents trying to exaggerate the enemy's losses, but actually by those governments that had the courage to tell the public the truth. In England, in the beginning of August, the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, stated their casualties at 330,000, of whom 61,000 had been killed and

196,000 wounded. The rest were missing, either prisoners of war or probably killed, though their bodies had not been found. As is only natural, the figures are even much higher in Germany; in Prussia alone the number of casualties amounts already to more than a million and a half.

"The greater part of those men have not been killed as in former centuries, in open strife, one man against another; their lives have been destroyed by bombs and shells, fired by an invisible enemy, by engines of destruction against which human courage is helpless, so that the soldiers can only hope that they may be spared themselves and that others, even their comrades, may be hit instead. For it is inevitable that some shall fall!

"At a time when human lives are destroyed on such a scale their value is not sufficiently realized by many. The hero of such a time is not the scientist who by the discovery of a serum against some dread disease, saves scores of human lives, but the man who instead of killing others with bombs has invented a new way of finishing his adversaries, by poisonous gas or otherwise. The demoralizing in-

fluence of reading war news is so strong that a German scholar who has frequently given proofs of great impartiality and whose humane feelings can not be doubted, wrote in his legal defense of the formal right to sink the *Lusitania* the terrible words that where this right existed the death of the passengers—that is of 1,500 innocent unsuspecting victims—need not be taken into account.

"Such is the situation after a year of European war. Death, ruin, economical waste, hardening of human feelings. Notwithstanding all those horrors the anniversary of the war has been solemnly commemorated in the warring countries; they have all declared that their nation is prepared for another year of the same horrors, even for more than one year; that they do not waver in their resolution to fight on till their aim shall be attained.

"In opposition to this strengthening of a warlike spirit on the anniversary of the war, we want to sound a word of Peace.

"We know that any one pronouncing the word of peace, whether he belongs to a neutral state or to one of the belligerents, rouses the indignation of

many. First of all of those whose doctrine has been chosen as the device of a new war publication, 'May the war last till everything has been subjected to our will.' Arguments are useless with people who hold such views and who think that 'power' should be the ultimate aim of all human effort.

"Mentioning the word peace also rouses the indignation of people who sincerely desire a 'lasting peace,' but who think that it can only be attained by continuing the struggle till the complete crushing of the adversary. They are blind to the lessons of history, which teaches that order can not be based on brutal force; that a nation becomes stronger when oppressed.

"Others—whose train of thoughts we can follow more easily—realize that international relations can not be based on brutal force; that the guarantees for a lasting peace can not be obtained by constraint from without, but who yet will not hear of peace, because they think that the adversary's state of mind has not yet undergone the necessary change to make reliance on a lasting peace possible.

"They are opposed to a peace which would only

be a '*fauler Frieden*,' a '*paix boiteuse*,' which would not guarantee an honorable and lasting peace after the enormous sacrifices made. According to those a peace made now would only mean a continuance of the old state of armed peace with its continual menace of war, its increase of armaments, with its distrust, hate and fear. They believe that if peace were made now it would only mean that, as formerly, the value of a state will not depend on its economical or intellectual importance, but only on its military strength.

"Without any doubt, all those who, like us, have organized themselves to promote a lasting peace, will agree with the last-mentioned advocates of the continuation of the war, that a peace, allowing the continuance of militarism, would be a great evil, a crime to those thousands who lost their lives in a 'struggle for peace.' Yet, when, strengthened by the approval of thousands in all parts of the world, we dare speak about peace, about the necessity of its preparation, this is due to the fact that in looking back over the indescribable sufferings in the first year of the war we see one comfort-

ing difference with August, 1914. Then the war-like spirit was unanimous, not one voice objected, all agreed that killing enemies was the only and the highest duty; all were pervaded with the same feeling of national unity and solidarity, which excluded any idea of international relations. So far it is only a beginning, a hesitating effort, but there is a note of dissent. The question is asked how long the struggle must continue; whether the time has not yet come to reconstruct instead of bringing ruin and desolation; whether many citizens of the belligerent countries are not more alike in character and ideals than the citizens of one and the same state often are?

"We should not forget that notwithstanding the still numerous utterances of hostility and war-fervor, there lives also another order of thoughts deep down in the consciousness of the warring nations, which more and more comes to the light. On both sides there are forces at work gathering the words of reconciliation and of co-operation spoken by the adversary, answering in the same tone of confidence and friendship.

"To encourage those voices, to convince those forerunners of the confidence and the kind disposition they will find on the other side, that is the noble task of such nations as have not been carried along by the maelstrom of passion and distrust, and are yet so closely allied to the warring nations that they feel the greatest compassion for their struggles, their doubts and their sufferings.

"Therefore, at a moment when the first anniversary of the war is commemorated and the decision to continue the struggle is proclaimed on all hands, we want to sound a note of peace—it is true with the modesty suiting the citizens of a small neutral country, but also with the consciousness that our words will re-echo in the hearts of many, even in the warring countries, who think like us, even if they do not utter their thoughts. We want to pronounce our confidence in the increasing force of these conciliatory voices. We want to appeal to those who, though they are pacifists, do not want to hear the possibility of peace and international co-operation discussed because they believe that a peace made now could only be an armistice and that

in the enemy's country militarism or marinism are still too firmly rooted to promise any amelioration in the future.

"We want to ask them whether they are blind to the signs of change; whether they think that their implacable attitude toward the hand advanced to them will lead to what we all desire—the extinction of militarism in all countries. Do they not see that their attitude strengthens the adversary's chauvinism; that it excites national pride till perhaps the hand that was advanced is drawn back again? We know that many hope that a continuance of the war will in the end compel the adversary to hold out his hand again, will compel the country to internal reforms which would consolidate the peace. But we ask again: do they believe, even if military compulsion were possible, that such a compulsory submission would have any value; would it not be much better that the common enemy should be attacked in all countries by voluntary co-operation according to a well-considered plan?

"A great danger threatens the world: that a just and acceptable peace should be possible at a certain

moment without being realized, and that the war should then end much later, without a real decision, but at a cost of even more millions of human lives, of even more milliards in money.

"There is also the danger that after long years of war, of even more horrible sacrifices, of even bitterer strife, at length one of the parties gains a complete victory so that he alone can dictate the terms of peace.

"Do the friends of a lasting peace, who will not hear of peace now, really think that then cool common sense will have a word to say to advise that moderation without which a lasting peace is impossible? Therefore it is necessary that already now the neutrals should speak openly of peace, of a just and durable peace. We once more emphasize the word 'durable,' which includes the idea of 'just,' for many still reproach us that we want peace at any price, that for us peace is the only, the highest, good. No reproach could be more unfounded.

"There may be many who, dazed and overwhelmed by all this misery, wish only one thing: peace. They do not care on what terms. But

we who have formed an organization because we know that a peace, as well as anything else, requires forethought in order to become durable, we consider the word peace as synonymous with a 'durable, just peace.' To give an example, we can not conceive that any government should be willing to offer its mediation for a peace which did not give perfect independence, political as well as economical, to Belgium.

"The annexation of a nation like Belgium, which has an honorable past as an independent state, would be so contrary to all civilization and political justice, would be such a homage to might over right, would contain the germ of so many new wars in the future that we repudiate with all our hearts the possibility of such a peace. We can not believe that at this stage of the war any responsible official, any parliamentary majority desires a peace based on such a violation of justice, which would at the same time be detrimental to the interests of the conqueror.

"We demand a just and durable peace; in this sense do we add our efforts for peace to the proc-

lamation of the Pope, who, on the 'sad anniversary of the outbreak of the tremendous conflict' pronounced his desire 'that the war may cease soon based on mutual benevolence and on respect for the rights and dignity of others.' "

The New York Peace Society

The New York Peace Society (William H. Short, Secretary) has formed a plan along the same general lines, but asking particularly for the renewal of The Hague Conference with the addition of a standing committee to which pressing matters can be referred in the eight-year interval between sessions.

The World Union

A League of Peace, ultimately to become a World Union, is the end sought by a group of statesmen in Great Britain, prominent among them being Viscount Bryce and Professor Lowes Dickinson of Cambridge. Their plans center on two matters—the reduction of armament and the placing of obstacles in the way of declaring war, through ma-

chinery of arbitration and conciliation. It is proposed that each nation bind itself by treaty to refer all disputes that might arise between them, if diplomatic methods of adjustment had failed, either to a court of arbitration for judicial decision or to a council of conciliation for investigation and report. They should not declare war or begin hostilities until the court had decided or the council had reported. The members of the Union shall put pressure, diplomatic, economic or forcible, on any signatory power that should act in violation of the preceding conditions. Provision is made to secure on these councils men with an international outlook who will not be mere agents of possibly reactionary or absolute governments. The details of this plan have been worked out provisionally, but have not yet been printed in detail.

A League of Peace

Mr. Hamilton Holt, of the *New York Independent*, has developed a special scheme for a League of Peace composed of those nations which shall agree to respect mutually one another's integrity

and territory. These are to have a periodical assembly which will make general laws subject to the veto of individual nations. Any nation in this League is to have the right to withdraw, with the certainty of being expelled, if it undertakes war preparedness on its own account.

The aggregate armament of this League, it is proposed, shall be higher than that of any single nation outside the League. Opportunity is to be given for such a nation to mend its ways and enter the association at any time.

The Foundations of a League of Peace

The following suggestions as to a League of Peace are made by Professor G. Lowes Dickinson of Cambridge:

* "The will to peace is the only sure guarantee of peace. But as, in the past, the will has been hampered by the machinery of European diplomacy, so in the future it may and should be confirmed by a change in that machinery. The system of alliances precipitated war; a general concert must pre-

* The paragraphs that follow are from articles in the *Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1914, and April, 1915.

vent it. We must create an organization by our will, and sustain our will by the organization. I will ask the reader, then, if his will is set upon peace, to go with me and ask what program we can put forward to convert will into practice when the new Europe is made after the war. For if it be not made so that it favors peace, it will be made so that it favors war. And which it will do depends in part upon the writer and the reader of this paper.

"Let us note, first, for our encouragement, that the lamentable condition under which Europe has been suffering for many centuries past, was not always its condition in the past, and need not be in the future. There was a time when the whole civilized world of the west lay at peace under a single rule; when the idea of separate sovereign states, always at war or in armed peace, would have seemed as monstrous and absurd as it now seems inevitable. And the great achievement of the Roman Empire left, when it sank, a sunset glow over the turmoil of the Middle Ages. Never would a medieval churchman or state have admitted that the independence of states was an ideal. It was an obsti-

nate tendency, struggling into existence against all the preconceptions and beliefs of the time. 'One Church, one Empire,' was the ideal of Charlemagne, of Otho, of Barbarossa, of Hildebrand, of Thomas Aquinas, of Dante. The forces struggling against that ideal were the enemy to be defeated. They won. And thought, always parasitic on action, indorsed the victory. So that now there is hardly a philosopher or historian who does not urge that the sovereignty of independent states is the last word of political fact and political wisdom.

"And no doubt in some respects it has been an advance. In so far as there are real nations, and these are coincident with states, it is well that they should develop freely their specific gifts and characters. The good future of the world is not with uniformity, but with diversity. But it should be well understood that all the diversity required is compatible with political union. The ideal of the future is federation; and to that ideal all the significant facts of the present point. It is idle for states to resist the current. Their trade, their manufactures, their arts, their sciences, all contra-

dict their political assumptions. War is a survival from the past. It is not a permanent condition of human life. And, interestingly enough, this truth has been expressing itself for a century even in the political consciousness of Europe. Ever since the great French wars there has been a rudimentary organ, the 'concert,' for dealing with European affairs as a whole. There is hardly an international issue for a hundred years past with which it has not concerned itself. It has recognized, again and again, not in theory only, but in practical action, that the disputes of any states are of vital interest to all the rest, and that powers not immediately concerned have a right and a duty to intervene. Not once but many times it has avoided war by concerted action. And though its organization is imperfect, its personnel unsatisfactory, and its possibilities limited by the jealousies, fears and ambitions of the several powers, it represents a clear advance in the right direction and a definite admission, by statesmen and politicians, that internationalism is the great and growing force of the present. What we have to do, at the conclusion of

this war, is to discover and to embody in the public law of Europe the next step toward the ultimate federal union. We must have something better than the concert. We can not hope to achieve the federation. What can we do? It would be presumptuous for any single thinker to put forward dogmatically his own suggestion as the best and most practicable. What I here set forth is, however, the result of much discussion and of much thought. I hope, therefore, that the reader may be willing to consider it seriously, whether or not he can indorse it.

"The preliminaries of peace must, I suppose, be settled between the belligerents; and it is probable, though very undesirable, that they will be settled behind the scenes by the same group of men who made this most disastrous and unnecessary of wars. For that reason, and because of the uncertainty of the duration and issue of the war, it is idle to consider how it may be disposed of. All we can say is, and it is essential that we should insist upon it, that the principle laid down by Mr. Asquith and indorsed, I believe, by every one who

had dealt with the subject, should be applied up to the limits of possibility; the principle, that is, that the interests and wishes of the populations it is proposed to transfer should be the only point considered, and that no power should pursue merely its own aggrandizement. Beyond this little can be said. . . .

"Let us suppose, now, that the preliminaries of peace have been settled, and settled, we must hope, on right lines. There should then be summoned a congress to regulate the carrying out of them in detail, and to provide for the future peace of Europe. There is plenty of precedent for such a congress. The Congress of Vienna followed the Treaty of Paris, and comprised representatives of every European power. The Congress of Paris followed the Crimean War, and at that Congress Austria was represented, though she was not a belligerent, and questions quite irrelevant to the immediate issues of the war were under discussion. The future settlement of Europe concerns everybody. Many of the non-belligerents are directly interested in the territorial changes that are likely to be made.

Many are interested in the fate of small states. All are interested in peace. This war is not only the belligerents' war, nor must the peace be only the belligerents' peace.

"Immediately, then, on the settlement of the preliminaries of peace, there should be summoned a congress of the powers. To this congress all the states of Europe should send delegates. But further it is most desirable that the United States should take part in it. There is precedent in the Conference of Algeciras. But if there were none, one should be created. It is, indeed, the best hope for the settlement that peace will be brought about by the mediation of President Wilson. And in that case the United States will have a clear status at the congress. It is the only great power not involved, or likely to be involved, in the war. And it is the only one that has no direct interest in the questions that may come up for solution.

"Assuming now that the congress is assembled, what will be its business? First, to appoint an international commission to carry out the territorial rearrangements, on the principle of the interests

and wishes of the peoples concerned. This will be a process long and arduous in proportion to the amount of the territory concerned and the character of the populations. At the best, readjustments of boundaries and allegiance can only imperfectly solve it. But the best chance of a good solution is an impartial commission.

"This, however, important though it be, should not be the main work of the congress. Its main work should be the creation of an organ to keep the peace of Europe. From many quarters has come the suggestion of a 'league of peace.' Mr. Roosevelt has proposed it. Mr. Asquith, as we saw, looks forward to it as coming 'immediately within the range, and presently within the grasp, of European statesmanship.' And it was advocated, virtually, by Sir Edward Grey when he said:

" 'If the peace of Europe can be preserved, and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavor will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany will be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia

and ourselves, jointly or separately.' (White Paper, No. 101.)

"An idea thus indorsed not only by pacifists and thinkers, but by practical statesmen, is worth serious consideration. Let us try to give it some practical shape.

"The powers, I propose, should found a league of peace, based on a treaty binding them to refer their disputes to peaceable settlement before taking any military measures. The success of the league would depend on the number of powers entering into it. A league, for instance, of Great Britain, France and Russia would do little more than perpetuate the present entente. A league joined by Italy would be in a better position. One joined by the United States might be invincible. But the thing to be most aimed at is the inclusion of the German powers. And that is one of the main reasons why, in the event of a victory by the allies, everything possible should be done not to alienate Germany from the European system.

"But, it will be said, what is the use of relying on treaties? This raises the question of the sanc-

tion of the treaty; a question of great importance, and one which, unfortunately, divides those who believe in and desire peace. The one party—the extremer pacifists, and perhaps the more logical—say that treaties must be their own sanction. The whole point of peace is that men rely on law, not on force. And to attempt to secure peace by arms is, and always has been, the fundamental error of mankind. This attitude, I think, goes along with the complete and uncompromising application of Christian ethics. Those who hold it would probably say that force should never be resisted by force. They would expect to conquer force by meekness. They are the real Christians. And I respect and honor them in proportion to their sincerity. But I can not go with them. What is more important, I know well that almost nobody goes with them; and that, in particular, no government would act, now or in any near future, upon such presumptions. It will be impossible, I believe, to win from public opinion any support for the ideas I am putting forward, unless we are prepared to add a sanction to our treaty. I propose, therefore, that the powers enter-

ing into the arrangement pledge themselves to assist, if necessary, by their national forces, any member of the league who should be attacked before the dispute provoking the attack has been submitted to arbitration or conciliation.

"Military force, however, is not the only weapon the powers might employ in such a case; economic pressure might sometimes be effective. Suppose, for example, that the United States entered into such a league, but that she did not choose, as she wisely might not choose, to become a great military or naval power. In the event of a crisis arising, such as we suppose, she could nevertheless exercise a very great pressure if she simply instituted a financial and commercial boycott against the offender. Imagine, for instance, that at this moment all the foreign trade of this country were cut off by a general boycott. We should be harder hit than we can be by military force. We simply could not carry on the war. And though, no doubt, we are more vulnerable in this respect than other countries, yet such economic pressure, if it were really feared, would be a potent factor in determining the policy

of any country. It is true that no nation could apply such a boycott without injuring itself. But then the object is to prevent that greatest of all injuries, material and moral, which we call war. We can then imagine the states included in our league agreeing that any offender who made war on a member of the league, contrary to the terms of the treaty, would immediately have to face either the economic boycott or the armed forces, or both, of the other members. And it is not unreasonable to think that in most cases that would secure the observance of the treaty.

"To get a clearer idea of how the arrangement might work, let us suppose it to have been in actual operation at the time this war broke out, and that all the great powers, including the United States, had entered into such a league as I propose. Austria-Hungary's ultimatum to Servia would then have involved a breach of the treaty and would have been prevented by the joint action of all the other powers. If Germany had supported Austria, she, too, would have become the common enemy. We should have had then not only the powers of

the Triple Entente, but also Italy and the United States leagued against the German powers. If it had been foreseen, as in the case supposed it would have been, that that would happen, the German powers, it is safe to say, would not have gone to war. What would have been the alternative? First, the immediate occasion of the war, the murder of the archduke, would have been referred to an international commission of inquiry at The Hague. For the question of the responsibility for the murder is a purely judicial one, to be settled by evidence before an impartial tribunal. But, of course, behind the murder lay the whole question of the Balkan states and their relations to Austria and Russia. The whole question would have had to be referred to conciliation before war could take place about it. Only in the last resort, when every effort of peaceful settlement had been avoided, when a solution on just lines had been propounded and was before the public opinion of Europe, only then could war have occurred. Perhaps war might then have occurred; but if so, probably on a much smaller scale; probably confined to Servia, Austria and Russia, with

the other powers ready at every moment to intervene for peace.

"It may still be urged that the powers that have entered into the league, will not, in fact, fulfil their obligation to intervene, by force if necessary, to prevent a breach of the treaty. But, if it be true, and be seen to be true, that peace is, at any moment, the greatest interest of the greater number of powers, then we may affirm that interest will reinforce obligation and that the duty imposed by the treaty will be fulfilled. The violation of one treaty obligation . . . must not make us suppose that no power will ever keep treaty obligations. The most cynical may admit that they will be kept when and if the interest of a power is on the side of keeping them. And, in this case, it would appear that generally the interest of the signatory powers would coincide with their duty.

"Let us now proceed to a more detailed consideration of the machinery of arbitration and conciliation to which it is proposed that the powers should bind themselves to refer their disputes.

"Among the disputes that may arise there is a

distinction, well recognized both in theory and practice, between those capable of arbitration and those requiring conciliation. The former are called 'justiciable,' and are such as can be settled by a quasi-legal procedure. Examples are the interpretation of treaties, or the application to particular cases of the rules of international law. The number of disputes which have, in fact, been settled by arbitration during the last century is very considerable. Two hundred and fifty is a conservative estimate [471, according to Darby]. Of these, no doubt, the majority were trivial. But some were of a kind that might easily have led to war. For example, the *Alabama* case, and the Alaska boundary case. Further, there is a court of arbitration, and a procedure, established at The Hague by agreement between the powers. Arbitration is thus a recognized and organized fact. All we have to do is to extend and regulate its operation. The powers entering the league of peace should bind themselves by a general treaty to submit to arbitration all justiciable disputes without exception. Such treaties have already been made between certain

powers. In particular, a treaty was negotiated in 1897 between the United States and Great Britain to submit to arbitration 'all questions in difference between them which they may fail to adjust by diplomatic negotiation.' But the majority of arbitration treaties except certain matters. Thus, for example, the treaty between France and England of 1904 was an agreement to submit all disputes except those 'affecting vital interest, honor, or independence.' But such exceptions seem to be superfluous when we are dealing with 'justiciable' disputes. The 'honor' of no country can be concerned in breaking either the terms of a treaty or recognized principles of international law. 'Independence' can not be touched by such cases. And 'vital interests' will almost always come under the other heading of non-justiciable cases, which we are proposing to refer to a different body and a different procedure. All that seems to be necessary here is to arrange for some procedure to determine, in case of difference of opinion, whether any given dispute is or is not 'justiciable.' This question might be submitted either to The Hague Court or

to the conciliation council proposed below. And with that safeguard I believe there to be no valid objection to a general treaty between all the powers to submit to arbitration all justiciable disputes.

"But of course justiciable disputes are not those most likely to lead to war. The most dangerous issues are those where the independence or the 'vital interests' of states are, or are supposed to be, involved. Perhaps in such cases, in the last resort, it may be impossible to avoid war so long as the false notions of interest now current continue to prevail. But it would be possible to postpone it. And mere delay will often make the difference between peace and war. What precipitated the present war was, first, the ultimatum of Austria, with its forty-eight hours' time-limit, and then that of Germany, with its twelve hours' time-limit. The war was rushed. Under our proposed arrangements this could not have happened. There would have been a period of delay, which might be fixed at not less than a year, during which the whole issue would be considered before a council of conciliation, a way out suggested, and the public opinion of all countries con-

centrated on the question and the proposed solution. I think it reasonable to suppose that, under such conditions, public opinion would not tolerate a war. At any rate, the chances of peace would be indefinitely improved.

"The main difficulty here is the constitution of the council of conciliation. First, what kind of men should be members of it? Not, clearly, men of merely legal training, for the questions to be considered will not be merely legal. What is wanted is men of eminence, experienced in affairs, capable of impartiality, and able to take a European rather than a narrowly national standpoint. It would not be easy to find such men, but it should not be impossible. One can think of several in this country.

"The members of the council should be appointed by whatever method the representative organs of the countries concerned might determine. But the important question then arises: Should they be delegates, appointed for a particular purpose, under constant instructions from their governments, or representatives for a fixed term of years to act according to their best judgment? In the first al-

ternative we shall have a body similar to that which has represented the concert of Europe again and again during the last century. Such a body may be and has been useful. In many cases it has avoided war, though in many it has failed to do so. But its functions have not been the same as those I am thinking of for the council of conciliation. It has not aimed at discovering the kind of solution of the questions before it which would commend itself to impartial and enlightened opinion as the most fair, reasonable and permanent. It has aimed rather at bringing together conflicting egotisms and ascertaining whether or no, in the given conjunction, it is worth while for any one, or more, of them to appeal to force in face of the others. Sometimes, as in the case of the Crimean War, this question has been answered in the affirmative; sometimes, as in the case of the Belgian revolution of 1830, in the negative. But no will for a permanent settlement on lines of justice has been present. The representatives of the powers have acted under instructions, each of them considering only the supposed interests of his own state, and making con-

cessions only when it seemed necessary to do so to avoid war, and when war for the moment did not appear to be a profitable enterprise. Further, the decisions of such a conference were to be followed immediately by action. It was natural, therefore, that temporary expedients to get over a crisis should be adopted, rather than fundamental and final reconstructions. The function I propose for the council of conciliation is different. It will have no executive power, only the power to recommend the best solution. This, it would seem, would best be done by an independent body, of which all the members should take, as far as possible, a European point of view, and none a merely national one. When they had arrived at their decision their duty would be ended. The question of its adoption would remain for a further stage.

"Keeping in view these facts, I incline to believe that the most hopeful plan would be that the council should have a permanent constitution, the members being appointed for fixed periods of time, and not for special issues, and acting without instructions from their governments, although, of course,

acquainted with their governments' point of view and having the confidence of their nation. On such a council there would be, if the league were large and comprehensive, a number of members whose governments were not directly interested in the particular issue that might be before them, and who might, therefore, take a detached view. The representatives of the countries primarily interested would be able both to put their point of view and to modify it in deference to the general trend of feeling. And a solution might be finally suggested which could not be suspected of partiality. It would, of course, not satisfy fully all claims. But it would probably commend itself to the public opinion of the world. And that would be a great asset in its favor.

"Still, it might be rejected by the parties most concerned. In that case what would happen? The whole question would then be one for diplomacy, and the powers would be as free to act, or not to act, as they are now. I do not propose that they should be under treaty obligation to enforce the award, or scheme, of the council. In a Europe such as we

may look forward to in which there should be a regularly constituted federation there could, of course, be no place for war. But what I am here proposing is a preliminary step toward that. I am not abrogating national sovereignty nor ruling out war as impossible. I am merely endeavoring to make it a great deal less likely than it now is. And I think that the attempt in the present stage to make the enforcement of an award compulsory on the powers would not make for peace. The powers must act, in each case, as they can and as they choose. Very often they will find a settlement which avoids war. Sometimes they will not. But at least we may reasonably hope for a much more general will for peace than we get under existing conditions.

"The improbability of war, I believe, would be increased in proportion as the issues of foreign policy should be known to and controlled by public opinion. There must be an end of the secret diplomacy which has plunged us into this catastrophe. To say this is not, of course, to suggest that complicated and delicate negotiations should be conducted in public. But there should be no more

secret treaties or arrangements of any kind, like, for example, the clauses of the Morocco treaties whereby Great Britain, France and Spain looked forward to the partition of that country while publicly guaranteeing its integrity and independence before the world; or like those military and naval 'conversations' by which, in effect, the Foreign Secretary pledged our honor to defend France in certain contingencies, behind the back of Parliament and the nation. All nations ought to know and constantly be reminded of all their commitments to other powers, and all the complications which constitute the danger centers of Europe. I am aware of all that may be said about the latent jingoism of crowds, and the power of an unscrupulous press to work upon it. But we have all that as it is. It is what governments rely upon and call upon when they intend to make war. The essence of the present situation is that no other forces have time to organize themselves, because we are actually at war before we have begun to realize the crisis. With plenty of time and full knowledge the better elements of public opinion could be rallied. The pro-

posed league of peace would secure the necessary delay. If, then, at the last, the public opinion of any nations insisted on war, there would be war. But at least every force working against war would have come into play.

"The objection is sometimes taken against our proposal that the league will be led to interfere in the internal affairs of its members, as the Holy Alliance did under the influence of Metternich. But this objection appears to rest on a misconception. In so far indeed as internal unrest in any state might generate international complications — as, for example, in the case of the oppression of the Slavs by the Magyars—it would be the duty of the council of conciliation to suggest a solution which would involve changes in the internal policy of the state in question. But the powers included in the league would not be bound to intervene by force if the solution should be rejected. And if any of them did in fact intervene, that would not be in consequence of the league, but in pursuance of a policy which they would have adopted in any case,

league or no league. The only contribution made by the council would be a wholly satisfactory one—a recommendation to a state pursuing an unsound policy of a policy more sound and more likely to lead to peace, a recommendation made by a body which might fairly claim to be supported by the public opinion of the world. Such a recommendation might be successful, and, if it were, it would be all to the good. If it were unsuccessful, the result would be at least no worse than if the league had not existed. For the terms of the treaty confer on the members of the league no right, and impose no duty, to intervene by force in the internal affairs of the component states.

"Given a league of peace, a limitation and reduction of armaments might follow. It might, indeed, be introduced even if no such league were formed. For economic exhaustion might lead the powers, after this war, to attempt seriously the limitation which was the immediate object of the First Hague Conference, but which was rejected as impracticable. It is most desirable that they should do so.

Yet it seems clear that whatever basis of limitation was laid down there would be plots to evade it on the part of one or another power, so long as there is no security against sudden and unprovoked attacks. Such security might be given by a league of peace. I do not see how it could be given otherwise. Nor would a mere limitation of armaments, in itself, prevent such attacks. It would make war less destructive; it could not make it impossible, or even improbable. Desirable, therefore, though this measure may be, it would seem that it would naturally follow or accompany, rather than precede, a league of peace.

"In any case, governments should cease to employ private armament firms. I am aware that there are technical and economic reasons to be urged against this course. But I believe them to be outweighed by the fact, now sufficiently proved, that the private firms deliberately encourage the growth of armaments in order to get orders for their goods.

"The suggestions here put forward are not intended to be more than a sketch of what might be

immediately practicable at the peace. They do not profess to represent in themselves an ideal. For political arrangements can not constitute an ideal; they can at most give it opportunity to realize itself. I hope, therefore, that after meeting the opposition of the skeptics and the practical men, I shall not have to meet that of the idealists. Some day, I hope with them, a Europe will come into being in which there will be neither enemy states nor rival armaments. But the time is not yet. There are many forces working in that direction, if only they had time to do their work. I want to give them breathing space. For what happens, under present arrangements, is that during years of peace the movement of civilization proceeds in its two inseparable aspects of social reform and international organization. Pacifists grow hopeful and active. Commerce, travel, art, literature, science, begin to unite the nations. Armaments appear ridiculous, and wars, what they are, crimes. But the enemy is watching. Silently, behind the scenes, he has been preparing. In a moment he strikes, and the work of a quarter of a century is undone. Let

us be under no illusions. While there is war there can be no secure progress. If we want society to develop into anything good, we must stop war. That, in itself, it is true will not give us the ideal. But it will remove a main obstacle to it. Change of will, change of ideas, moral and spiritual development, that is what we want, I agree. But we can no longer afford to rely only on that. For before that has become strong enough to make war impossible, war arrives and destroys the development. A device to avoid war, even though it be in a sense only mechanical, is therefore none the less essential. Then, with the peace thus secured, the new Europe may slowly be built up. Otherwise, those who want no new Europe can always sweep away its rudiments by force. I ask, therefore, the support of idealists as much as of practical men. I ask the support of all except those who believe that war itself is the ideal. Of those who believe in peace these men are the only ultimate enemies. But they can not be converted. They must be circumvented. And what I suggest would, I believe, be a way to circumvent them."

The League to Enforce Peace

A more developed form of Holt's idea, with a greater extension of the police force behind it, is found in the platform of The League to Enforce Peace, adopted at Philadelphia in June, 1915, William Howard Taft being president. This plan contemplates a league of law-abiding nations, pledged to attack any of their number or any other nation which shall first *begin hostilities*. The theory is that any international difference is susceptible of examination and adjustment or arbitration. The whole neutral or law-abiding world is thrown into confusion by any act of war. War is in itself the denial of law and a declaration of war is in itself an avowal of lawlessness. Such a declaration affects the rights of all nations and all nations have the right to be consulted.

The central idea of the League to Enforce Peace is thus stated by its president, Mr. Taft:

"All the world is interested in preventing war in any part of the world. Neutrals are so subject to loss, to injury and to violation of their rights, that

they have a direct interest in preventing war, and so direct is their interest that we may well hope that international law may advance to the point of developing that interest into an international right to be consulted before war begins with neighbors. The central basis of the plan which we respectfully recommend to the authorities who shall represent our government in any world conference that will necessarily follow the peace, is that the great powers of the world be invited to form a League of Peace, which shall embody in the covenant that binds its members the principle just announced, to wit, that every member of the League has a right to be consulted before war shall be perpetrated between any two members of the League; or to put it another way, that the whole League shall use its entire power to require any member of the League that wishes to fight any other member of the League to submit the issue upon which that member desires to go to war to a machinery for its peaceful settlement before it does go to war."

The following detailed statements of purpose have been recently put forth by the League, and

these have the general approval of the friends of peace in America:

"The league of nations here proposed would be brought into existence after the close of the present European war and would have as its object the establishment of a permanent condition of law and order among the nations. The League does not concern itself in any way with the war now in progress. It seeks instead to unite the great mass of sentiment against war which will exist in this and other lands after the unparalleled slaughter now going on, in a practical plan to prevent the repetition of such disaster.

"The maintenance of law and order in its own territory is an imperative duty which every nation owes to its citizens. A further duty is to join with other nations in maintaining law and order in the society of nations. Neglect of the former duty results in anarchy at home; neglect of the latter, in anarchy among the nations.

"For the establishment of law and order in their own territory, the Thirteen American States found it necessary to create a Federal Government. For

the establishment of law and order among the nations of the world it has manifestly become necessary to create a federation, or League, of the nations, with definite but limited powers.

"As America has in the past borne her part in working out and establishing the principles of justice and democracy between individual men within the nation, it is now her duty to share the burden of the nations in making the world, their common heritage, a place where peacefully inclined states can be secure in their rights and liberties. Oceans which formerly required months to traverse have shrunk almost to rivers with the advent of modern means of communication. The day has passed for maintaining America's traditional policy of isolation, as it passed half a century ago for the maintenance by Japan of her peculiar policy of isolation.

The League's Proposals

ARTICLE I

"'*All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted*

to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.'

"A justiciable question is one which can be settled according to the principles of law and equity. Our claims against England arising from the ravages of the Confederate cruiser *Alabama* were justiciable. So were the Alaska Boundary and the North Atlantic Fisheries Disputes. Many of the quarrels between nations are of this character.

"Just as individuals settle between themselves many controversies which might be carried before the courts, so nations settle by negotiation, through diplomacy, most of the disputes which arise between them. The habit is a good one and ought to be continued. But when diplomacy fails to settle a quarrel between nations, it is no more logical and right for them to resort at once to war than it would be for two men who had failed to settle a private difference to draw their pistols and begin to shoot.

"Against the time when citizens failed to agree, the state has provided the courts as agencies to

mete out justice and to promote peaceable relations between them. Against the day when two or more states of the American Union fail to settle their controversy, the Federal Constitution has provided the Supreme Court as an agency for administering justice and maintaining peace between those states.

"The problem of securing justice among the civilized nations and of maintaining peaceful relations among them is, in its essence, the same as we have successfully solved in the national and municipal realms and can with equal propriety and success be entrusted to a judicial tribunal or court. The best thought in all the civilized nations is, indeed, already agreed that such an international court ought to be constituted and to have jurisdiction over all justiciable questions, save those which may be reserved by treaty agreement for settlement in some other way.

ARTICLE II

" '*All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation shall be sub-*

mitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation.'

"Disputes arise between nations which they are unable or unwilling to settle according to rules of international law. Political questions and questions of national policy often belong to this class. A controversy concerning the Monroe Doctrine would probably present a non-justiciable issue, as might also the arbitrary exercise of our undoubted right to admit or to exclude such immigrants as we might think to be helpful or harmful to our national life.

"But if one's neighbor believes that he will be injured by a proposed course of action, a just and peace-loving man is ready to talk it over, even though his legal right to do what he proposes is perfectly clear. So a nation which desires justice and peace will be ready to listen to the advice of a council of conciliation concerning a policy or course of conduct which aggrieves a sister nation, before persisting in it.

"While America would not readily consent to have the Monroe Doctrine go before a court for

judicial review and decision, there is no reason why we should not listen to what a board of distinguished and honorable men, intent on securing justice and preventing war, have to say concerning the broad international aspects and results of a *proposed application* of this doctrine. On the contrary, there is every reason why we should listen to such impartial advice on this or any other question, given, as it would be, under a deep sense of responsibility. The more certain we were of the justice of our cause, the more desirous we were to maintain just and peaceful relations with the world, the more ready we should be to listen.

"It hardly needs to be pointed out to Americans to-day that the interests of humanity and of neutral nations are more sacred than is the right of any one state to insist on taking her own course without waiting to see what other nations think about its justice, or what the results to the world may be. Valuable as the principle of arbitration and conciliation is in keeping peace between individuals, it is still more vital for the solution of the grave questions on which the welfare and the peace

of the whole world depend. No nation has a right to claim exemption from the obligation to give a hearing to friendly nations in disputes to which she is a party.

ARTICLE III

"'*The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.*'

"The chief instrument by which peaceful relations are promoted between individuals is law, interpreted by the courts and enforced, when necessary, by police and military power. No better way exists for promoting peaceful relations between the nations than the extension of this method to the international sphere. In frontier towns without a police, citizens had to arm to protect themselves, and assaults and assassinations abounded. In the absence of an agreement among the nations to establish at need a posse comitatus for the protection of

any state which may be wrongfully threatened by another, each nation, no matter how devoted to peace, is compelled to arm for its own defense. It is a sort of *frontier* condition which exists among the nations and its results are disastrous as we now see plainly. The only way to bring national preparation for war within reasonable limits is by a better and stronger international preparation to keep the peace.

"The kernel of the proposals of the League to Enforce Peace is found in the provision for using the joint forces of the nations, economic and military, against any state which breaks the peace before resorting to arbitration or conciliation, and doing it forthwith without stopping for consultations and parleyings which often result in doing nothing.

"The difficulty of ascertaining which nation begins a war will not impair the effectiveness of the proposal that the League shall combine against the aggressor, any more than the effectiveness of the police as peace officers is impaired by the fact that it is often impossible to tell which of the two men

began a fight on the street. In doubtful cases the policeman does not attempt to decide who was the aggressor, but subdues the man who resists arrest and takes both parties to the quarrel before the magistrate, whose duty it is to decide the responsibility for the assault. So the League would not have to decide who committed the original offense, but would use its forces against the nation that persisted in making war before submitting the dispute to the court or the council of conciliation.

"The League does not propose that decisions of the court and recommendations of the council of conciliation shall be enforced. Experience teaches that if a conflict is postponed until the cause of controversy has been publicly examined, war will generally be prevented. In those rare cases in which differences are so profound that people will fight over them at any cost, it is still worth while to postpone the conflict, to have a public discussion of the question at issue before a tribunal, and thus to give to the people of the countries involved a chance to consider, before hostilities begin, whether the risk and suffering of war is really worth while.

Article IV

"'*Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in Article I.*'

"An international assembly which should meet periodically to formulate and codify rules of international law is an essential part of the plan for securing international peace. It would provide a means for anticipating controversies before they arise and settling them in a spirit of friendly co-operation in time of peace. It would afford an opportunity for raising the standards of international law and laying down fundamental principles which, without such conference, are liable to remain indefinite. If it were provided by international agreement that the acts of such a body should have the force of law unless some nation within the League interposed a veto within a specified period, such a

conference would steadily grow in moral power and might well prove to be, in the end, the most valuable feature of the proposed League.

"These proposals are put forward as pointing out the road along which the nations must sooner or later travel in their efforts to establish a just and stable peace, and not as a complete and final plan. It is realized that they are not free from objections. The representatives of the nations assembled to draw up a treaty which should establish a League to Enforce Peace would no doubt modify them. They might not be willing to go so far as is here proposed; they might wish to go much farther and to provide for a more complete form of world government than is now suggested.

"Full confidence in the general wisdom of the plan existed, however, among the three hundred distinguished men who composed the Independence Hall Conference and the much larger number who had examined and approved the resolutions but were unable to attend. It was felt to be of vital importance to begin now the unification of opinion around a plan so simple as to be practical and attainable,

so that a great body of supporters in many lands will be prepared to present and urge it upon the attention of their governments when the reorganization of Europe and of the world is under consideration at the close of the war."

Such an alliance as is here contemplated is foreign to the traditions of the United States, though the time may come when these traditions should be readjusted. A democracy is, however, a form of government ill-fitted for knight-errantry. Moreover, a League of Peace is one especially hard to hold together, especially at first.

In spite of these facts and with some doubt as to the word "enforce," as against "maintain," the writer signed the constitution of the League, believing that "Time brings Counsel," and if the practical results from the League are what we hope, we shall be better fitted later than now to state what sanction, if any, it can receive from an international force, it being understood that the "force" to be used at need is essentially a police force, that is, an organized group wholly under civil control to carry out civic purposes. The

League involves the beginning of World Federation, but the cement of such an organization must lie in common interest and human intelligence—not in force.

A Congress of Neutrals Proposed in the Pan-American Union

"The first international conference of neutral nations which discussed questions arising out of the present war was a meeting of the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union at Washington, December 8, 1914. The delegates from eight American republics, most of them acting under specific instructions from their governments, urged united action by the American nations to assert the necessity of newer and clearer definitions of neutral and belligerent rights, and to consider some of the burdens placed upon commerce by the European war. It was declared by some of the speakers that the complications between America and European states already resulting from the presence of belligerent warships in American waters had demonstrated anew the vital need of Pan-American solidarity.

"After a general discussion the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

" 'The governing board of the Pan-American Union declares:

" '1. That the magnitude of the present European war presents new problems of international law, the solution of which is of equal interest to the entire world.

" '2. That in the form in which the operations of the belligerents are developing, they redound to the injury of the neutrals.

" '3. That the principal cause for this result is that the respective rights of the belligerents and the neutrals are not clearly defined, notwithstanding that such definition is demanded both by general convenience and by that spirit of justice, which doubtless animates the belligerents with respect to the interests of the neutrals.

" '4. That considerations of every character call for a definition of such rights as promptly as possible upon the principle that liberty of commerce should not be restricted beyond the point indispensable for military operations.

" 'On these grounds the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union resolves:

" '1. A special committee of the same is hereby appointed to consist of nine members, of which the Secretary of State of the United States shall form part, acting as chairman thereof ex-officio.

" '2. This commission shall study the problems presented by the present European war and shall submit to the Governing Board the suggestions it may deem of common interest. In the study of questions of technical character this commission will consult the Board of Jurists.

" '3. Each government may submit to the committee such plans or suggested resolutions as may be deemed convenient on the different subjects that circumstances suggest.'

"The committee was immediately appointed, to consist of the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Ambassadors from Brazil, Chile, Argentina; the Ministers from Uruguay, Peru, Ecuador and Honduras. Mexico was not represented.

"To the committee thus created the government

of Venezuela instructed its representative at Washington to submit a proposal for a congress of neutrals. This proposition was formally presented to the committee, January 7, 1915, by the Venezuelan Minister, Doctor Santos A. Dominici, in a speech, of which the following paragraphs are an abstract:

" 'We all agree that the circumstances attending modern warfare demand, more sternly each day, new limitations of the rights of belligerents in order to safeguard the rights of neutrals, and that it is beyond discussion that over against the rights of belligerents stand the rights of neutrals to prepare and organize an effective action for their own security.

" 'This is the action proposed by Venezuela in the shape of a congress of neutrals to define, in the light of modern warfare, the rights and duties of neutrals, and in time to submit their conclusions to a congress of all nations; these conclusions, after being unanimously accepted—as it is meet they should be, as a matter of justice and expediency, because the belligerent of to-day is the neutral of

to-morrow—should be embodied definitely in international laws.

" 'The Venezuelan government also believes that such a congress might establish a new duty, that of a union of neutrals in case of conflicts of the magnitude of the present, in order to protect their own interests; a duty the logical consequence of which would be a new right, that of mediating, which should, of course, be exercised with all such restrictions and limitations as would make it compatible with the respect due to the rights of belligerents. Thus we should, by a further step, come to the creation of a permanent body, which from the very beginning of a conflict would represent such union of neutrals, and in the exercise of its right to be heard might in the majority of cases avoid a rupture, and in any case might limit the extent, duration and range of hostilities.' "

The Commission of Inquiry

A plan of a Pan-American Union for Peace has been submitted to the Union by Alberto Membreño,

Minister from Honduras to Washington. The last of the memorandum is as follows:

"Among the wise provisions contained in The Hague Convention of 1907, there is one, in Article IX, creating an international commission of inquiry. Unfortunately this provision excludes, from the remedy provided, disputes involving either the honor or the vital interests of nations; in other words, the very cases in which the services of impartial parties are most needed to study the issue calmly. Experience shows that duels are not fought—and duels are serious questions of honor among individuals—when the seconds obtain an explanation which is satisfactory to the one who claims that an offense has been committed demanding a blood satisfaction. Those who discharge executive functions in the government of states are, so to speak, more strictly under obligation to hear and consider reasons based on justice and expediency because, if it is true that in war they run a certain amount of personal risk, the greatest sacrifice is made by the people, and the damage, as in the present instance, extends to all nations.

"The government of the United States representing the people of the United States—a people who believe that the prosperity of nations results from work and not from the extermination of those who in the struggle for life are battling for victory—has enhanced the principles set forth by the authors of The Hague Convention, in the sense that the commission of inquiry may take cognizance of all disputes of every nature whatsoever.

"This doctrine as amended is a part of the treaties lately concluded between the United States and almost all the American nations, as well as many European countries. We may, therefore embody it in international law.

"I take the liberty of proposing that the members of the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union present to their respective governments for their consideration the following rules:

"1. All disputes of every nature whatsoever which it has not been possible to adjust through diplomatic methods shall be referred for investigation and report to an international commission, and, pending the full discharge of its duties by said

commission, the nations engaged in the dispute can not declare war or begin hostilities against each other.

"2. This commission shall be a permanent one, and may act on its own initiative. In this case it behooves the commission to serve due notice to the parties in dispute, and to request their co-operation in order fully to discharge its duties.

"3. The number of members of which the commission shall consist, their qualifications, manner of appointment, place where the commission shall sit, manner of procedure, and time for the submission of its report, shall be fixed by treaty or by any other method whereby the agreements reached by the governments may have full force and authority."

CHAPTER III

WOMEN AND WAR

The Woman's Peace Party

THE Woman's Peace Party, under the lead of Jane Addams, has a peace program of real importance. The purpose is to bring woman, the greatest sufferer under war, and to whom, as a class, war has never shown any consideration, to her natural place as the uncompromising opponent of war. An outgrowth from the meeting held in Washington in January, 1915, was the World's Congress of representative women, meeting at The Hague on the twenty-eighth of April, under the presidency of Jane Addams and on the invitation of Wilhelmina, Queen of Holland. This meeting can not fail to be of the greatest value in determining the public opinion among the women of Europe. It can hardly bring immediate cessation of hostilities. It may not even shorten the war, but it should certainly have a great influence in determining fu-

ture public opinion. Its program is essentially similar to that of the Woman's Peace Party of America, the purpose of the meeting not being to make new declarations, but to encourage and solidify throughout the world the feeling of women against war and the war system.

The women ask for the gradual organization of the world for order, and the substitution of law for war; for the limitation of armaments, for international police, democratic control of foreign policies, enfranchisement of women, organized opposition to militarism at home, and the education of youth in the ideas of peace; for the removal of the economic causes of war, and, as an immediate measure, the calling of a conference of neutral nations.

The women have been the first to insist on freeing the schools from the influence of militarism with its distortions of history and its perversions of the spirit of patriotism, from love of country to hatred and distrust of other peoples.

The following is the platform of the Woman's Peace Party, adopted at Washington, January 10, 1915:

"The purpose of this organization is to enlist all American women in arousing the nations to respect the sacredness of human life and to abolish war. The following is adopted as our platform:

"1. The immediate calling of a convention of neutral nations in the interest of early peace.

"2. Limitation of armaments and the nationalization of their manufacture.

"3. Organized opposition to militarism in our own country.

"4. Education of youth in the ideals of peace.

"5. Democratic control of foreign policies.

"6. The further humanizing of governments by the extension of the franchise to women.

"7. 'Concert of Nations' to supersede 'Balance of Power.'

"8. Action toward the gradual organization of the world to substitute Law for War.

"9. The substitution of an international police for rival armies and navies.

"10. Removal of the economic causes of war.

"11. The appointment by our government of a

commission of men and women, with an adequate appropriation, to promote international peace.

"12. That we denounce with all the earnestness of which we are capable the concerted attempt now being made to force this country into still further preparedness for war. We desire to make a solemn appeal to the higher attributes of our common humanity to help us unmask this menace to our civilization."

The Women of Norway

The League of the Women of Norway had still earlier developed a similar line of thought and policy.

The Women's Congress at Berne

The International Social Women's Congress at Berne (April, 1915) demands "a speedy ending of the war by a peace which shall expiate the wrong done to Belgium, impose no humiliating conditions on any nation, and recognize the right of all nations, large and small, to independence and self-government."

Mediation Without Armistice

The idea of "Mediation Without Armistice" is strongly urged in the Wisconsin Plan, the work of Julia Grace Wales, an instructor in the University of Wisconsin and a member of the Wisconsin Peace Society. Of all the discussions of the possibilities of mediation and the ways to get it, the Wisconsin Plan seems to be the best thought out and apparently the most practical. One difficulty arises from the fact that the men whose character and knowledge and judicial training would enable them to sit on a commission in continuous session, such as the Wisconsin Plan proposes, are needed to help mediate at home—especially in the neutral countries of Europe, where the passions are strongly stirred by the events happening at their very doors.

Its general purpose is thus stated by Miss Wales:

"The International Plan for Continuous Mediation without Armistice suggests that an International Commission of experts be formed, to sit as

long as the war continues. The members of the Commission should have a scientific but no diplomatic function; they should be without power to commit their governments. The Commission should explore the issues involved in the present struggle, and in the light of this study begin making propositions to the belligerents in the spirit of constructive internationalism. If the first effort fail, they should consult and deliberate, revise their original propositions or offer new ones, coming back again and again if necessary, in the unalterable conviction that some proposal will ultimately be found that will afford a practical basis for actual peace negotiation. The Commission should be established without delay, on neutral initiative.

"Our agreement for Continuous Mediation without Armistice rests on the following convictions:

"(1) That humanity should be able to find some method of avoiding prolonged wholesale destruction;

"(2) That on both sides there are people who believe themselves to be fighting in self-defense, who desire a right settlement, and who ought not

to have to fight against each other; that it is an ultimate outrage against humanity that they have to do so;

"(3) That the only way to straighten the tangle is to adopt and persistently employ the device of placing simultaneous conditional proposals ('will you ——— if the rest will?') before the belligerents; that neither side can think correctly or effectively unless it has among the data of its thinking exact knowledge as to how the enemy (not merely the government but the various elements of the people) would react to every possible proposal for settlement;

"(4) That truth tends to work on the mind, and that to place sane standing proposals before the nations would tend to ripen the time for peace;

"(5) That delay is dangerous because bitterness and the desire for revenge are growing stronger, and the civil power in all warring countries is daily growing weaker in proportion to the military;

"(6) That there ought to be a commission of experts sitting throughout the war and in some

way holding the possibilities of settlement before the belligerents; that world consciousness is trying to break through; that a world thinking organ should be created and that the creation of such an organ at this juncture would concentrate and render effective the idealism of all nations and open the possibility of establishing, upon a deposed militarism, the beginnings of World Federation.

"The neutral argument assumes that both sides are equally in the wrong—an assumption contrary to truth and hence fundamentally immoral.

"In reply to this charge we emphatically assert that the neutral propaganda for Continuous Mediation without Armistice makes no such assumption. What is does assume is that, in any case, there are some right-thinking people on both sides. In an appeal for co-operation to right-thinking people in all countries, neutral and belligerent, whatever their national prejudices in connection with the present war, we believe that it would be out of place to dogmatize as to which side, if either, represents the cause of international righteousness for which we desire to contend, in working for the es-

tablishment of an international commission. We believe that any nation sincerely fighting for the right has nothing to fear from the plan and much to gain, that the plan is on the side of any country that is on the side of international righteousness. We believe that the plan of Continuous Mediation without Armistice will tend to assist and reward right motives in every country and to thwart wrong motives. We believe that the citizen of any country understanding our plan and believing that his own country is fighting for the right will feel that the plan is favorable to his own national cause. We believe that the plan, if carried out, would, while thwarting short-sighted national selfishness, tend to bring ultimate good to all lands—the genuine and permanent benefit which depends on the welfare of the family of nations as a whole. Among those working for the establishment of the international commission are people of various national sympathies. Probably there is no one working for the establishment of the international commission who has not a personal opinion as to which side on the whole represents the cause of right. We

feel, however, that difference of opinion as to the sincerity of the belligerents, the responsibility of the war, and the attitude which the various nations will take in the settlement need not prevent us from working together provided that we are agreed in our desire for the establishment of a permanent peace based on principles of international righteousness."

The Mediatory Commission of Neutrals

After the return of Miss Jane Addams from Europe the following resolutions were made public by a committee in New York and Chicago:

"Whereas: The outcome of recent missions to the governments of the warring nations warranted the belief that, while the nations at war are not willing themselves to begin negotiations or even signify a desire to do so, lest it be interpreted as a sign of weakness and place them at a disadvantage in the final peace settlement, there are, nevertheless, in each of the warring nations civil officials and other citizens who would welcome affirmative

action by a neutral agency to bring about a peace based on international justice;

"Be it resolved: That we urge the appointment of an international commission, drawn from the neutral nations of Europe as well as the United States, which shall explore the issues involved in the present struggle and on the basis of its findings submit propositions to the belligerent nations, in the hope that such effort will not only clear the ground for final peace negotiations, but also influence such terms of settlement as will make for a constructive and lasting peace.

"We believe that through some such effort on the part of neutrals, carried on continuously during the progress of the war, the European conflict can be ended by negotiation rather than by exhaustion, and in a manner that will not perpetuate the mistaken ideas of international relationships that have brought on the present conflict.

"Because of the mixed population of the United States, its size, and its geographical isolation, the American members for such a commission should

first be appointed and should ask representatives of the neutral nations of Europe, similarly appointed and approved, to confer with them. These should constitute an informal commission which should act continuously and evolve tentative proposals, submitting them to the various governments in the unalterable conviction that some proposal will ultimately be found that will afford a practicable basis for actual peace negotiations.

"The American citizens selected for this mission, while having the approval of President Wilson, should in no case be authorized to commit the president of the United States government to any proposition which the commission should put forward."

The reasons against an official commission and the justification of the plan proposed are thus set forth by Mr. Louis P. Lochner (*San Francisco Examiner*, October 3, 1915):

"A conference of all neutrals would make an unwieldy body and one in which there might be many reactionary tendencies represented, which might defeat the very purpose of such a conference; that an official gathering would be bound

by conventionalities and diplomatic usages of the past, while the present situation demands forward-looking, constructive action; that any commission, however appointed, would probably be rebuffed at first, and that the president of the United States, responsible for the 'honor' of the country, could not risk the eventuality of even a temporary failure.

"The first approach to the situation must probably be non-governmental. A commission of neutrals, such as is proposed, would perhaps work out somewhat in the following manner:

"The men chosen must be of broad human experience, coming from fields of work inherently international in character—such as commerce, labor, science, religion—men who will command respect at home and abroad, but who at the same time are ready to enter upon their duties with the full expectation of seeming to labor fruitlessly at first, much as the arbitrators in a labor strike are at first rebuffed again and again by both sides, until finally some little point, to which both sides agree, is the entering wedge for negotiations leading to a complete settlement.

"These men, chosen from among our American citizens, should ask representatives of the neutral nations of Europe, similarly appointed and approved, to confer with them.

"At first they would probably be ignored by the belligerent press. During that time they would merely study and explore the issues involved. But let us not forget that in each of the warring countries there are tremendous popular currents at work demanding an early peace.

"They have not been very successful thus far, because there was no concrete proposal to which they could direct the attention of their governments. They were denounced as 'peace-prattlers,' as 'anti-patriots,' and when they became too aggressive, were raided by the police, as happened a few days ago in the case of the *Vaterland Neues Bund*, of Germany, an organization which numbers among its members some of the best minds of the empire.

"But once such an international commission of neutrals were in session, these democratic currents could reassert themselves with renewed force. How-

ever stringent the censorship, we have abundant proof that news, nevertheless, keeps filtering through. What excuse could a government offer these internal critics for refusal to assent if an unofficial commission were to ask that a man of international experience, say like Herr Ballin, director-general of the Hamburg-American line, and without committing his government, state what, in his opinion, would be a method of approach that might be satisfactory to Germany?

"The bare, though lamentable, fact of the present situation is that there is absolutely no clearing-house or central agency through which there can be any interchange of ideas between the belligerents. Such a commission, if it did nothing else, would first of all become a means of contact.

"After exploring the issues, then; after summoning to its councils men of similar high standing to represent the belligerents unofficially; after working out various methods of approach that would as far as possible harmonize the conflicting claims and counter-claims; such a commission could then unofficially sound the governments themselves with

some such proposal as this: 'Will you agree to adopt or even consider the accompanying propositions, or any phases of them, as a basis of peace, if and when the governments of the other warring powers will agree to do likewise?'

"In short, the unofficial commission would act up to the time that some actual basis were found for official action—at which time the governments themselves, through their regular channels, would assume negotiations.

"But even supposing that the commission made no impression whatever upon the warring governments, that all its efforts to bring the belligerents together failed. Still it would have tremendous value. For, even accepting for the moment the fallacious theory of 'a fight to a finish,' the war can not go on forever, and sooner or later negotiations must, after all, take the place of military action. When these negotiations begin, there will be more need than ever of wisdom and constructive statesmanship to prevent a settlement along the lines that will merely mean the perpetuation of the conditions that led to the present war. A con-

structive peace program worked out by the commission proposed could not but be of far-reaching influence upon the men assembled around the green table. Students of The Hague conference will remember how William T. Stead, though not a member of the conference, virtually became its directing head through his publication of a daily news sheet that told the diplomats assembled how to proceed.

"The labor, peace, and woman's organizations are already preparing to meet at the same time and place with the conference of diplomats to bring the pressure of public opinion to bear upon the peace settlement negotiations. The conclusions of such a deliberative commission as above described would probably be accepted by these bodies as a basis for common action. It is hard to foresee how such united action would not have profound influence upon the peace deliberations."

The International Committee of Women

The following statement from the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace was issued in New York and Amsterdam on October 15, 1915:

"That the nations now engaged in war would look without disfavor upon a conference of the neutral nations as a possible medium for the settlement of the conflict, and that the neutral nations of Europe are prepared for such a conference provided they can get the co-operation of the United States, is declared in a public statement issued by the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace.

"The International Congress of Women, which met at The Hague last April, appointed two groups of envoys, one to the belligerent governments and to Holland and Switzerland; the other to Russia and the Scandinavian countries. The reports of these embassies form the basis for the announcement issued to-day here and in Amsterdam.

"In their joint report the leading members of these two delegations unite in stating that the evidence and assurances given them have convinced them that the belligerents would not consider such a conference unfriendly, and that the neutrals would not be unwilling to act, if first assured of American co-operation.

"The three foreign delegates came to the United States in September, and the executive committee since then has been in conference with the American delegates.

"The envoys were received by the following, among others:

"Prime Minister Asquith and Foreign Minister Sir Edward Grey, in London; Reichskanzler von Bethmann-Hollweg and Foreign Minister von Jagow, in Berlin; Prime Minister Stuergkh, Foreign Minister Burian, in Vienna; Prime Minister Tisza, in Budapest; Prime Minister Salandra and Foreign Minister Sonnino, in Rome; Prime Minister Viviani and Foreign Minister Delcassé, in Paris; Foreign Minister d'Avignon, in Havre; Foreign Minister Sasonoff, in Petrograd.

"And by the following representatives of neutral governments:

"Prime Minister Cort van der Linden and Foreign Minister Loudon, in The Hague; Prime Minister Zahle and Foreign Minister Scavenius, in Copenhagen; King Haakon, Prime Minister Knudsen, Foreign Minister Ihlen, and by Messrs. Loevland,

Aarstad, Castberg and Jahren, the four presidents of the Storthing, in Christiania; Foreign Minister Wallenberg, in Stockholm; President Motta and Foreign Minister Hoffman, in Berne; President Wilson and Secretary of State Lansing, in Washington.

"While in Rome, the delegation went unofficially —that is to say, without a mandate from the Congress—to an audience with the Pope and the Cardinal Secretary of State.

"The signers of the statement were themselves leading members of the two groups of envoys."

To the end indicated above the following manifesto was issued by envoys of the International Congress of Women at The Hague to the governments of Europe and the president of the United States:

"Here in America, on neutral soil, far removed from the stress of the conflict, we, envoys to the governments from the International Congress of Women at The Hague, have come together to canvass the results of our missions. We put forth this statement as our united and deliberate conclusions.

"At a time when the foreign offices of the great belligerents have been barred to each other, and the public mind of Europe has been fixed on the war offices for leadership, we have gone from capital to capital and conferred with the civil governments.

"Our mission was to place before belligerent and neutral alike the resolutions of the International Congress of Women held at The Hague in April; especially to place before them the definite method of a conference of neutral nations as an agency of continuous mediation for the settlement of the war.

"To carry out this mission two delegations were appointed, which included women of Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United States. One or other of these delegations was received by the governments in fourteen capitals—Berlin, Berne, Budapest, Christiania, Copenhagen, The Hague, Havre (Belgian government), London, Paris, Petrograd, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna and Washington. We were received by the prime ministers and foreign ministers of the pow-

ers, by the king of Norway, by the presidents of Switzerland and of the United States, by the Pope and the Cardinal Secretary of State. In many capitals more than one audience was given, not merely to present our resolutions, but for a thorough discussion. In addition to the thirty-five governmental visits we met—everywhere—members of parliaments and other leaders of public opinion.

"We heard much the same words spoken in Downing Street as those spoken in Wilhelmstrasse, in Vienna as in Petrograd, in Budapest as in Havre, where the Belgians have their temporary government.

"Our visits to the war capitals convinced us that the belligerent governments would not be opposed to a conference of neutral nations; that while the belligerents have rejected offers of mediation by single neutral nations, and while no belligerent could ask for mediation, the creation of a continuous conference of neutral nations might provide the machinery which would lead to peace. We found that the neutrals, on the other hand, were concerned lest calling such a conference might be

considered inopportune by one or other of the belligerents. Here our information from the belligerents themselves gave assurance that such initiative would not be resented. 'My country would not find anything unfriendly in such action by the neutrals,' was the assurance given us by the foreign minister of one of the great belligerents. 'My government would place no obstacle in the way of its institution,' said the minister of an opposing nation. 'What are the neutrals waiting for?' said a third, whose name ranks high, not only in his own country, but all over the world.

"It remained to put this clarifying intelligence before the neutral countries. As a result the plan of starting mediation through the agency of a continuous conference of the neutral nations is to-day being seriously discussed alike in the cabinets of the belligerent and neutral countries of Europe and in the press of both.

"We are in a position to quote some of the expressions of men high in the councils of the great nations as to the feasibility of the plan. 'You are right,' said one minister, 'that it would be of the

greatest importance to finish the fight by early negotiation rather than by further military efforts, which would result in more and more destruction and irreparable loss.' 'Yours is the sanest proposal that has been brought to this office in the last six months,' said the prime minister of one of the larger countries.

"We were also in position to canvass the objections that have been made to the proposal, testing it out severely in the judgment of those in the midst of the European conflict. It has been argued that it is not the time at present to start such a process of negotiation, and that no step should be taken until one or other party has a victory, or at least until some new military balance is struck. The answer we bring is that every delay makes more difficult the beginning of negotiations, more nations become involved, and the situation becomes more complicated; that when at times in the course of the war such a balance was struck, the neutrals were unprepared to act. The opportunity passed. For the forces of peace to be un-

prepared when the hour comes is as irretrievable as for a military leader to be unready.

"It has been argued that for such a conference to be called at any time when one side has met with some military advantage would be to favor that side. The answer we bring is that the proposed conference would start mediation at a higher level than that of military advantage. As to the actual military situation, however, we quote a remark made to us by a foreign minister of one of the belligerent powers. 'Neither side is to-day strong enough to dictate terms, and neither side is so weakened that it has to accept humiliating terms.'

"It has been suggested that such a conference would bind the neutral governments co-operating in it. The answer we bring is that, as proposed, such a conference should consist of the ablest persons of the neutral countries, assigned, not to problems of their own governments, but to the common service of a supreme crisis. The situation calls for a conference cast in a new and larger

mould than those of conventional diplomacy, the governments sending to it persons drawn from social, economic and scientific fields who have had genuine international experience.

"As women, it was possible for us, from belligerent and neutral nations alike, to meet in the midst of war and to carry forward an interchange of question and answer between capitals which were barred to each other. It is now our duty to make articulate our convictions. We have been convinced that the governments of the belligerent nations would not be hostile to the institution of such a common channel for good offices; that the governments of the European neutrals we visited stand ready to co-operate with others in mediation. Reviewing the situation, we believe that of the five European neutral nations visited, three are ready to join in such a conference, and that two are deliberating the calling of such a conference. Of the intention of the United States we have as yet no evidence.

"We are but the conveyors of evidence which is a challenge to action by the neutral governments

visited—by Denmark, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States. We in turn bear evidence of a rising desire and intention of vast companies of people in the neutral countries to turn a barren disinterestedness into an active good-will. In Sweden, for example, more than four hundred meetings were held in one day in different parts of the country, calling on the government to act.

"The excruciating burden of responsibility for the hopeless continuance of this war no longer rests on the will of the belligerent nations alone. It rests also on the will of those neutral governments and people who have been spared its shock but can not, if they would, absolve themselves from their full share of responsibility for the continuance of war.

"Signed by

"Alletta Jacobs [Holland].

"Chrystal Macmillan [Great Britain].

"Rosika Schwimmer [Austro-Hungary].

"Emily G. Balch [United States].

"Jane Addams [United States]."

Constructive Peace

The Women's Movement for Constructive Peace, directed by Mrs. F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, of London, endeavors to organize public opinion and to bring pressure on the governments of the world toward certain ends. Those especially distinctive are the suffrage of women, a league of law-abiding nations for mutual defense and a change in the attitude of future Hague conferences as to laws of war. The regulation of war hitherto attempted at The Hague is "based on a pernicious principle in that it treats as natural the existence of war, and only aims to prune off some features regarded as objectionable, instead of trying to make war impossible."

This again strikes at the heart of the evil. But it is questionable whether attempts to humanize war, however unsuccessful or however disregarded by generals bent solely on victory, have ever stood in the way of any direct moves against war. Men have tried to humanize war, when they could attack it in no other fashion. Those who defend war ap-

prove all its brutalities. In their eyes war consists in mutual destruction of nations and in its application it "knows no bounds." The more intolerable its enormities the sooner will the weaker yield to the strong; the sooner will be the advent of peace. But this method of frightfulness has never been potent to bring real peace. It culminates in long enduring hate. Moreover, to defend it is to assume that the stronger nation is in the right, which, in history, has been the exception rather than the rule.

The School Peace League

The American School Peace League, of which Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews is secretary, is primarily composed of teachers in public schools of the United States. Its first aim is the right instruction of school children in national and international matters. Its published platform demands a "Concert of Europe," based on some principle of democratic representation. "Nationality" should be respected, and humiliation and revenge should be erased from international relations. The League demands "limitation of armaments" with abolition of private profit of citizen or corporation.

CHAPTER IV

RESOLUTIONS OF CONGRESSES

National Education Association

THE National Education Association of the United States in its world congress in Oakland, California, after an elaborate preamble, put itself on record as follows:

"1. The Association looks upon the war now ravaging the continent of Europe as a tragedy having no parallel in history. This war is working havoc among the best racial elements in all nations concerned, exhausting the near future, bringing impoverishment to the race and throwing an intolerable burden of sorrow and misery on women and children. The Association expresses the fervent hope that the measures adopted at the peace settlement conference will be founded on justice, and will thereby break down militarism and free the world from the fear of another calamity like the present. The Association heartily indorses the

policy of the president of the United States concerning both the European and the Mexican situations. It rejoices in his eminent services to the cause of peace, which is the cause of law. To the president of the United States is primarily due the fact that this republic has remained law-abiding, despite currents of fear, hate and excitement, and stands firm on the only basis on which civilization can be restored or peace maintained—the foundation of law.

"2. The Association deplores any attempt to militarize this country. It again declares against the establishment of compulsory military training in the schools on the ground that this is reactionary and inconsistent with American ideals and standards. The Association expresses its approval of the policy of the Boy Scouts of America in keeping their useful work free from connection with military affairs.

"3. The Association believes that the promotion of international relationships in education, science, art, industry and social service is of fundamental importance, and that these can best be worked out

by a co-ordination of the organized forces of the civilized world. To this end international associations should have affiliated national organizations, in each case with a central body having delegates from each affiliated nation. In the interest of permanent peace and of world research a reorganization of international organizations should follow the establishment of peace in Europe. The United States, with other neutral nations, has a great duty to perform in this work of reorganization.

"4. The Association feels that we have reached a time when interdependence and mutual understanding should create their proper organs of expression through permanent officials, whose duty would be to report to their home governments on the work and progress of constructive social agencies in the country of residence. The presence of military and naval attachés in all embassies and legations emphasizes the least desirable of factors of international relations."

The Association believes that the constructive side of relations among nations should be emphasized, and recommends that each of the national

governments which have participated in this International Congress on Education should be urged to appoint educational attachés as well to their legations and embassies in foreign countries.

International Peace Congress

The following resolutions were adopted at the International Peace Congress at San Francisco, October 13, 1915:

"This Congress gratefully recognizes that to the president of the United States is largely due the fact that this republic has remained law-abiding, despite currents of fear, hate and excitement, and that it stands firm on the only basis on which civilization can be restored or peace maintained—the foundation of law.

"The defense of the republic is not primarily a matter of armies and navies, but it lies in justice, conciliation and trust in international law. While we do not urge disarmament under present conditions, we are opposed to the current wide-spread demand for costly preparation against hypothetic dangers. If exhausted Europe is an increased men-

ace to America, it must likewise be so to other neutrals, while armament expansion on our part incites similar action in the nations of South America and Asia.

"The hoped-for leadership of America in the achievement of a new world order would be defeated by her surrender to the belief that the lesson of the great war is that she should seriously enter further into the old world competition in armament, for, in the words of Washington, 'overgrown military establishments are, under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty.'

"This Congress looks with apprehension on the presence in advisory boards of the United States government of men personally interested in the preparation, manufacture or sale of munitions of war.

"The Congress further questions the propriety of appointing on congressional committees men who are or who have been concerned with the manufacture or trade in war materials.

"Meeting in this International Exposition, which

stands as a great triumph of peace, the Congress brings this indictment against war:

"The great war is bleeding Europe white. It is working havoc without parallel in the best racial elements in all nations concerned, thereby exhausting the near future and bringing subsequent impoverishment, physical and mental, to the race.

"An intolerable burden of sorrow and misery is thrown on the women and children in the various nations—those who have no part in bringing on the war and no interests to be served by it.

"No possible gain, economic or political (the integrity of invaded territory being assured), can compensate any nation for the loss, distress and misery involved in this war and aggravated by every day of its continuance.

"No probability exists that military operations in any quarter, on land or sea, can of themselves bring the war to an end.

"A sweeping victory on either side, even if attainable, would not contribute to the solution of the problems of Europe, being sure to leave an increasing legacy of hate with the seeds of future wars.

"The outcome of recent missions to the governments of the warring nations warrants the belief that, while the nations at war are not willing themselves to begin negotiations or even signify a desire to do so, lest it be interpreted as a sign of weakness and place them at a disadvantage in the final peace settlement, there is, nevertheless, abundant evidence that those charged with the administration of the foreign policies of these nations would welcome, or at least not oppose, affirmative action by a neutral agency to bring about a peace based on international justice.

"This Congress therefore respectfully urges the president of the United States to co-operate with other neutral governments in calling a conference of neutral nations, which would constitute a voluntary court of continuous mediation, would invite suggestions of settlement from each of the warring nations, and in any case submit to all of them simultaneously reasonable proposals as a basis for peace.

"The numerous programs for a constructive and lasting peace, formulated since the beginning of

the war by national and international conferences prove a deep-seated and universal revulsion against the forces and ideals that have brought on the present conflict.

"This popular demand for constructive peace, if directed into definite channels, will exert a profound influence on the terms of peace.

"This Congress rejoices that the international labor, women's and other movements are preparing for international meetings to be held at the same time and place as the conference of powers which shall arrange the terms of peace. Provision should be made by which other bodies, too, shall be represented in a similar manner.

"To this end the Congress advocates the immediate constitution of a joint committee of representatives of all forces interested in the furtherance of a lasting peace along the lines outlined by the Emergency Peace Federation of Chicago, which committee shall establish a central clearing-house and insure a constant and persistent campaign of education and action, national and international.

"The program of the League to Enforce Peace,

lately adopted in Philadelphia, represents a constructive plan to prevent international war among civilized nations.

"With the members of the League, we believe it to be desirable for the United States to enter a real partnership of nations based on equal rights for all and established and enforced by a common will. Such a league should bind the signatories substantially to the following, which, with slight alterations, is identical with the program of the League to Enforce Peace:

"First—All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

"Second—All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation.

"Third—The signatory powers shall jointly use

first, economic pressure and later, if necessary, international police force, against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

"Fourth—Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal above mentioned.

"This Congress strongly urges the calling of the third Hague conference to follow as soon as possible the conclusion of the present war. It further urges that the delegates to such conference represent the civil and not the military authority of their respective countries.

"This Congress expresses its cordial approval of the policy for restoring order in Mexico by the co-operation with our government of other American republics. This has tended to allay the fears

of the peoples of South America regarding the policy of the United States. We believe that fear and force can not bring respect, and that the moral influence of a nation tends to fail as its military equipment increases.

"This Congress believes that the Monroe Doctrine should merge in a League of Peace of the Temperate Americas, which should effectively put an end to civil and international war on this continent.

"This body appeals to the Congress of the United States to adopt an immigration policy based on the just and equitable treatment of all races —a policy that will grant the rights of citizenship regardless of race or nationality; and to provide that all aliens should be under the special protection of the national government.

"The combined influence of the women of all countries is one of the most effective forces in opposition to war. We recognize that this influence can not be fully exerted except through the adequate recognition of their social and political rights.

"This Congress believes that universities and

colleges should undertake especial research and instruction in international relations and the sanitation of international politics and diplomacy by the application of science to the higher relations of men.

"This Congress deplores every attempt to militarize this country. It declares against the establishment of military training in the schools, on the ground that this is reactionary and inconsistent with American ideals and standards, and leading toward the greatest burden yet borne by a civilized nation, that of military conscription—a condition incompatible with liberty.

"Signed by the committee:

"David Starr Jordan, Chairman.

"Louis P. Lochner, Secretary.

"H. H. Bell.

"Sidney F. Gulick.

"Herbert S. Houston.

"Frederick Lynch.

"Lucia Ames Mead.

"Robert C. Root."

The Peace Alliance of Australia

The Australian Peace Alliance declares for arbitration, democratic control of foreign policy, reduction of armaments, and nationalization of their manufacture, the organization of labor unions against war, and the termination of the present war as soon as may be on the following terms:

No transfer of territory without the affirmative vote of its people; no treaty or undertaking without the open consent of parliament; the influence of Great Britain to be thrown toward an international council whose deliberations and decisions shall be made public. Further they demand a drastic reduction of armament, the neutralization of its manufacture and the prohibition of its export. Finally, they urge the universal abolition of conscription or compulsory military training.

The last demand few other societies have ventured to make, though it is in the long run the most important of all. It strikes at the heart of the whole war system. If a peaceful nation is nowhere menaced by a "nation in arms," the war

spirit will in time die away. The system of conscription is the tap-root of evil in Europe. The domination of military Prussia over scientific and industrial Germany would be impossible if military service were not a universal experience. And the final purpose of prolonged military drill is not war-efficiency but industrial subserviency.

The Japanese Peace Society

The Peace Society of Japan, of which Count Okuma, now Premier, is president, has devoted itself mainly to bringing about harmonious relations between Japan and the United States. Says Baron Kanda, one of the leading scholars of Tokyo, "The rumors of misunderstanding and uneasiness we hear sometimes are but ripples on the surface. In its profound depths, the Pacific is grandly at rest."

The International Union of Ethical Societies

The International Union of Ethical Societies, of which Gustav Spiller, of London, is secretary, lays absolute stress on the revival and the respect of

international law with the reference of all serious differences to an international tribunal for judicial settlement.

The European Federation for Peace

The European Federation, of which the secretary is Nico van Suchtelen, of Blaricum, Holland, expressly stands for national morality. It is convinced that "the relation of civilized states toward each other should be governed by the same laws of morality and justice as social life in the nations individually." It is moving toward a bond of union among those states which respect these principles and for the formation of a public opinion that shall demand adhesion to them.

CHAPTER V

PEACE MANIFESTOES

The Church and Peace

THE manifesto of the Church Peace Union represents the attitude of the American churches, almost unanimously opposed to militarism. I here quote it in full:

"In this time of tumult, when more than half the population of the globe is involved in war, the Church of God should counsel:

"Moderation. Partisanship is adding fuel to fires of passion which already are too hot. Clergymen should allay prejudice, not intensify it. Each of the warring nations believes in the justice of its cause. Their disputes are of long standing, involving all the governments concerned, and their full history is yet to be written. In a period of such tense feeling, it is not easy to unravel the tangled skein of motives and events. It is a grievous thing that there is war between peoples whom

we respect and count our friends. In this calamitous hour, denunciation of either side assumes a superhuman knowledge of complex policies and purposes, imperils the influence of our government in promoting peace, aggravates a quarrel which we should help to abate, creates dissensions among our own people, inflames a war spirit in America, and gives force to the criticism that the church has abdicated its sacred function as the maker of peace and concord.

"Penitence. We should realize not only that each of the warring nations has helped to create the conditions of which the war is a tragic expression, but that these conditions characterize Americans as well as Europeans. We are quite as belligerent in temper as other men. We should condemn the causes of war; but we should look for them not so much in state papers as in the fears and prejudices and rivalries which are common to men everywhere except as they are influenced by the Divine Spirit. Our own freedom from militarism has been due to protecting oceans rather than to superior virtue. The present clamor for an

armament to resist a possible attack is prompted, not by peril, but by the disposition to echo on our side of the sea the cries which have been heard in Europe for years, and it is engendering the same suspicions that have wrecked the relations of Germany and Great Britain. Are we to repeat the policy which is drenching the continent with blood? This is the time to prepare, not for war, but for peace.

"Faith. God only can 'speak peace' to the nations. He alone can re-create a chaotic world. Materialistic civilization has developed mind and energy rather than conscience. The peoples whose universities are the greatest, whose statesmen and philosophers the most famous, whose industrial achievements the most advanced, whose armies and navies the most colossal, are the very ones that are fighting. Modern science has equipped race hatred with deadlier weapons and thus increased its power for ruin. A world order built up by secular education and dependent on force has collapsed. Christianity has not failed; but nations have failed to be Christian. The ideas underlying this war spring

from a savage interpretation of life and directly contravene the teachings of Jesus. The paramount need, therefore, is a new interpretation in the light of a fresh discovery of God and of what He requires of man. This need transcends questions of national policy and armament. The settlement of existing strife awaits its fulfilment. There is no other hope for humanity. The task is stupendous; but 'all things are possible to him that believeth.' Have we faith to believe, faith to draw boldly upon the undeveloped resources of the Church in God for the reconstruction of the world?

"Righteousness — international righteousness. Religion too often has been conceived as so local and personal that it had no relation to national policies. Men in their corporate capacity as a state have ignored moral laws that as citizens they uphold. The time has come to insist that the law of the jungle should be replaced by the law of humanity; that there is no double standard of ethics; that there can not be one rule for individuals and another for their governments; that deceiving others, oppressing the weak, stealing ter-

ritory, destroying property and murdering rivals, acts which are criminal between men, are no less wrong between nations; that the real greatness of a people lies not in regiments and battleships but in justice and forbearance; and that 'righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.'

"Brotherhood. We profess to believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; that 'God hath made of one blood all nations.' Why has not this gospel wrought its normal work among the nations? Why are men trying to settle by slaughter what can be settled only by mutual goodwill? Because they have not accepted the implications of their belief; because they regard one another as foes rather than as friends. Clearly then it is the mission of the churches to inculcate the principles of mutual respect and confidence, to make real the faith that we preach. Let us keep out of the wordy warfare about incidents which, however lamentable, are the concomitants of all wars, and concentrate our efforts upon the major evangel of divine brotherhood. When nations are walking

among heaps of powder with lighted matches an explosion is inevitable sooner or later. The vital question concerns not so much the dropping of a match as the presence of powder. Why was it there? If nations fear and hate one another they will fight whether they annually add one or a dozen battleships to their navy, or a thousand or a hundred thousand men to their army. The Golden Rule must be made effective in international intercourse. This is the urgent duty of the churches, and American churches now have free opportunity to speak. They should be the channel through which the grace of God can become operative. They should make clear the distinction between the teachings of Jesus and so-called modern civilization, cease baptizing national pride and selfishness with the name of patriotism, put forth greater effort to make the divine spirit leaven all human relationships, and proclaim the missionary message of international Christianity, of altruistic ministries to other peoples, of God as the universal Father instead of a national deity, of the unity of the human race, of religion as 'the power of God unto salva-

tion' and the antithesis of aggression and brute force.

"Sympathy. For our brethren on both sides, many of whom are fighting more in grief than in anger; for the sick and the wounded; for parents bereft of their sons, wives of their husbands, and children of their fathers. Let us not complain that in this era of agony we are called upon to give largely of our means, but let us be humbly grateful that we can help our brothers in their time of utter need.

"Prayer. That the spirit of God may so pervade the governments and peoples now at war that peace may be speedily established on a basis of mutual forbearance and love; that with humble confession of our sins we seek a fuller understanding of the divine purpose for men and its more consistent expression in the life of nations; that the brutal and selfish elements in our civilization may be eliminated; that all men may realize that they are brothers; that all who are ministering to the physical and spiritual needs of the soldiers and their suffering wives and children may be given needful

grace and strength; that the God of all pity and comfort may help the sick, the wounded and the dying, and guide the sorrowing peoples who are groping their way in the darkness that has fallen upon them; and that out of the tumult and strife of this present time the longings of a stricken world may be realized in an era of universal righteousness.

"'And the work of righteousness shall be peace.'"

The New Union of the Fatherland

The *Vaterland Neues Bund* (New Union of the Fatherland), lately formed in Berlin and having as leading members such publicists and scholars as Walter Schücking, Lujo Brentano, Heinrich Lammasch, Hans Delbrück, Hans Wehberg, Otfried Nippold, Ludwig Quidde, Siegmund Schultz, has the following expressed purpose:

"The furtherance of all efforts that will make for infusing into politics and diplomacy of Europe the idea of peaceful competition and international cooperation, and that in turn will lead to a political and economic understanding between the culture-

peoples of Europe. This will be possible only if the present system is thrown overboard—a system which enables a few men to decide the fate of hundreds of millions of human beings."

This union is on record in strong opposition to the retention by Germany of Belgium or any part of France. It is one of the most important of all the groups interested in ending the war with lasting peace. This fact arises from the intellectual importance of the members of the *Bund* and from the relation of their nation to the problems in question for the future of Europe hinges on the ability of the German people to control the affairs of the German nation. The members of the *Bund* are not of the Social Democrat party, though their international aims have much in common.

Prevention of War

"An International Authority and the Prevention of War," published by Mr. L. S. Woolf in the *New Statesman* (London, July 10 and July 17), seems to be one of the ablest and most lucid studies of the history of the international problems of to-day.

It leads up to a constructive plan having much in common with that of the League to Enforce Peace.

"The first difficulty," says Mr. Woolf, "is to get the governments, either of the eight great powers or of the forty lesser states, all of them necessarily wary and suspicious, to agree to the creation of any such international machinery. . . . No impairment of sovereignty and no sacrifice of independence are proposed. Each State remains quite free to go to war in the last resort, if the dispute in which it is engaged proves intractable. Moreover, national disarmament, to which at this moment no State will ever dream of taking the smallest step, is left to come about of itself, just as the individual carrying of arms falls silently into desuetude as and when fears of aggression die down before the rule of the law. The new world that we have to face at the conclusion of the war will perforce start from the ruins of the old— . . . The alternative to War is Law. . . ."*

* Extract from "An International Authority and the Prevention of War," by L. S. Woolf. *The New Statesman*, Special Supplement, July 17, 1915. (Fabian Studies.)

The essence of Mr. Woolf's proposals is therefore "the establishment of International Authority." The plan proposes a scheme of embargos, prohibitions, duties, fines or boycotts, which shall leave war as the very last resort, in case of continued obstinacy.

The idea is carefully developed and the facts behind it admirably stated. It would, however, not be easy for the authorities of the United States to bend their people to such a complex arrangement, although the nation might be pledged to a "benevolent neutrality."

* "Now it is possible to say without begging the question that in the last one hundred years a system of international relationship has been very rapidly developing with rudimentary organs for regulating the society of nations without warfare. If we are really to transform that '*some sort of international organization* into a definite international organization which will commend itself to the disillusioned judgment of statesmen and other "prac-

* *Id.* The *New Statesman*, Special Supplement, July 10, 1915.

tical" men,' we must build not a Utopia upon the air or clouds of our own imaginations, but a duller and heavier structure placed logically upon the foundations of the existing system. I, therefore, propose to analyze the most important parts of the existing system, in order to see in what respect it has, during the last century, succeeded and failed in preventing war.

"Before proceeding to this task it will be advisable to answer a preliminary objection which in the present temper of the world is bound to occur to one's mind at various points of the inquiry. Systems and machinery, it is said, are not the way to prevent war, which will only cease when men cease to desire it; Europe, relapsed to-day into barbarism, shows that men will never cease to desire it; we must face the fact that international law and treaties and arbitration will never prevent these periodical shatterings of our cizilization; one week of last August was sufficient to sweep away the whole elaborate progress of a century. One meets this train of reasoning continually at the present

time. It is woven out of pessimism and two fallacies. The first fallacy is the historically false view which men invariably take of the present. It is almost impossible not to believe that each to-day is the end of the world. Our own short era seems invariably to be in the history of the world a culmination either of progress or dissolution. But in history really there are no culminations and no cataclysms; there is only a feeble dribble of progress, sagging first to one side and then to the other, but always dribbling a little in one direction. Thus the French Revolution was for every one in it the end or the beginning of the world. The aristocrat dragged through the streets of Paris to the guillotine saw himself perishing in a holocaust of all Law, Order, Beauty and Good Manners; the men who dragged him saw only the sudden birth of Justice and absolute liberty. Both were wrong, just as both would have been wrong if they had suddenly found themselves transported some thirty years on into the Paris of the second decade of the nineteenth century, for the aristocrat would have seen the culmi-

nation of his hopes and the Red of his despair. In each case it was only a little sag in the progress of history, first to this side and then to that, though the main stream was dribbling slowly in the direction of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. So with this war. Its tremendous importance to us produces in us a delusion that in the history of the world it is tremendously important. But it is neither the beginning nor the end of anything; it is just a little sagging to one side, to violence and stupidity and barbarism, and in ten or fifteen or twenty years' time there will be a sagging to the other side, to what we dimly recognize as a progress and civilization.

"The other fallacy is of the same nature as that dreary assertion that you can not make men good by act of Parliament. In one sense the assertion is a truism, and in another it is so simple that if a majority of men want to fight, no international law, no treaties or tribunals will prevent them; on the other hand, society is so complex that though the majority of men and women do not want to fight, if there are no laws and rules of conduct, and no

pacific methods of settling disputes, they will find themselves at one another's throats before they are aware of or desire it."

The Pope's Appeal for Peace

The Pope, Benedict XV, has issued the following appeal for peace to the peoples now fighting and to their chiefs:

"When We, however unworthy, were called to succeed that most tender Pontiff, Pius X, on the apostolic throne—Pius X, whose saintly beneficent life was cut short by grief at the fratricidal strife just broken out in Europe—We cast a trembling glance round Us at the bloodstained fields of battle, and We felt the anguish of a father who sees his house devastated, his people homeless, through some furious hurricane. And thinking, with Our heart inexpressibly stricken, of Our young sons who have been cut off by death in thousands, We felt in Our heart, filled with the love of Christ, all the shock of mothers and wives prematurely widowed, the inconsolable grief of children too soon orphaned of their father's guidance. In Our heart, which shared

the terrible anxiety of innumerable families, and knowing well the imperious duties laid on Us by the sublime mission of peace and love entrusted to Us in such sad times, We at once conceived the firm intention to consecrate all Our activity and all Our power to reconcile the belligerent peoples; and of that We made solemn promises to the Divine Saviour who willed to make all men brothers at the price of His blood.

"The first words which We, as Supreme Pastor of souls, spoke to the nations and their rulers were of peace and love. Our counsel was affectionate and insistent, both as father and friend, but it was not listened to. Sadness grew in Us, but Our intention did not weaken; We turned with trust to the Almighty, who has in His hand the minds and hearts both of subjects and kings, invoking from Him the cessation of the awful scourge. We desired that all the faithful should join in Our fervid and humble prayer, and, to render it more efficacious, We ordained that it should be accompanied by works of Christian penitence. But to-day, on the sad anniversary of the outbreak of the tremendous conflict,

the desire that the war may cease soon comes from Our heart more warmly, Our fatherly cry for peace more strongly. May this cry overcome the fearful crash of arms and reach the peoples now at war and their chiefs, including both the one side and the other to more kindly and serene counsels.

"In the holy name of God, in the name of our heavenly Father and Lord, by the blessed Blood of Jesus, the price of human redemption, We conjure you whom Divine Providence has called to govern the fighting nations to put an end once for all to this awful carnage, which has already been dishonoring Europe for a year. It is brother's blood which is being poured out on sea and land. The best soil of Europe, garden of the world, is sown with corpses and ruins; where a short time ago flourished the industry of the workshop, the fruitful labor of the fields, now cannon thunders awfully, and in its fury of destruction does not spare village and city, sows havoc and death everywhere. You bear before God and men the tremendous responsibility of peace and war; listen to Our prayer, the paternal voice of the Vicar of the Eternal and Supreme

Judge, to whom you must give an account of your public doings as of your private actions.

"The copious riches which God the Creator has given to the lands subject to you make possible for you the continuation of the strife; but at what cost? Answer, the thousands of young lives spent every day on the battlefields; answer, the ruins of so many cities and villages, so many monuments which you owe to the piety and genius of your ancestors. And the bitter tears poured out in the privacy of the domestic hearth, or, joined with prayer, at the foot of altars—do not these, too, repeat that the price of the long-drawn-out struggle is great, too great?

"Nor let it be said that this huge conflict can not be settled without the violence of arms. Let each put aside the purpose of destruction, and reflect that nations do not die; impatiently they bear the yoke put on them, preparing for revenge, and handing down from generation to generation a miserable heritage of hatred and vengeance.

"Why not now think with calm conscience of the rights and just aspirations of the peoples? Why

not initiate, with good will, an exchange of views, direct or indirect, in order to take account of those rights and aspirations as far as possible, and so succeed in putting an end to the awful strife, as has happened in similar circumstances before? Blessed be he who first shall raise the olive branch, and give his right hand to the enemy, offering reasonable conditions of peace. The equilibrium of the world and the prosperous and sure tranquillity of the nations rest on mutual benevolence, and on respect for the rights and dignity of others, more than on the multitude of armed forces and a formidable ring of fortresses.

"This is the cry of peace which comes from Our heart more strongly on this sad day; and We invite all who are the friends of peace in the world to help Us in hastening the end of the war, which for a year has made of Europe one vast battlefield. May Jesus in His mercy, through the intercession of His Sorrowful Mother, bring about that at last may rise, after so awful a tempest, the calm and radiant dawn of peace, image of His divine countenance. May there be heard soon the hymns of gratitude

to the Most High, giver of all good, for the happy reconciliation of the states; may the peoples return, in the brotherhood of love, to the peaceful rivalry of studies, arts and industries, and when the rule of right is restored, may they resolve to entrust for the future the solution of their differences, not to the drawn sword, but to reasons of equity and justice, studied with the necessary calm thought. This will be their finest and most glorious conquest.

"With the dear hope and trust that such desirable fruit of the tree of peace may come soon to comfort the world, We impart the Apostolic Benediction to all who form the mystic flock entrusted to Us, and also for those who do not yet belong to the Roman Church, We pray the Lord to bring them close to Us with bonds of perfect love.

"Given from the Vatican, at Rome, July 28, 1915. BENEDICT XV, POPE."

CHAPTER VI

INDIVIDUALS AND PEACE

Basis of Peace in Europe

PRESIDENT CHARLES W. ELIOT has given a well-considered "*Basis of Peace in Europe.*" * The essential features expressed are these:

1. No civilized nation to have dominion over another, large or small.

2. Absolute security guaranteed for the small states, and reasonable adjustments for districts held against the will of the inhabitants.

3. Immunity to commerce in time of war, the high seas and the channels of commerce to be free, under international guarantees.

4. The open door to trade.

5. The seizure of distant colonies or adjoining provinces by force to be abandoned.

* *New York Times,* May 3, 1915.

6. The compensation of Belgium, the sum involved to be adjusted by neutral arbitration.

7. Reduction of armament with establishment of a supreme international tribunal, the maintenance of an international military and naval force and the stable development of international law.

"The path of peace," says the *New York Times*, referring to Doctor Eliot's statement, "lies open in the sight of all these nations, peace with honor, with the hope of permanence. It is time. There are no right purposes to be accomplished by the further prosecution of the war that may not be achieved in the deliberation of a dozen men seated at the council table. In the terms of peace enforced by conquest there would almost certainly lie the germ of future wars. . . . For the happiness of mankind, for the prosperity of nations, the difference is inconceivably great."

Plan to End War

Under the title of *A World-Wide Plan to End War*, a scheme having something in common with the League to Enforce Peace, had been earlier pub-

lished by General Harrison Gray Otis, of Los Angeles. This plan goes into much detail and may be found useful when the exhausted belligerents find it possible to come to an agreement. "Under the plan proposed," says General Otis, "the last resort would never come because the recalcitrant nation would find itself in a hopeless plight."

Enduring Peace

The following suggestions are made by Honorable William J. Bryan:

"To my mind the paramount question now is not 'Who began the war?' or 'Which side has been most cruel in its conduct of the war?' History will render a verdict on these questions when passion has subsided and when all the facts are obtainable. The most important question now is, 'How can peace be restored?'

"The war can not last always; the end must come some time. Why should any belligerent nation hesitate to state the conditions upon which it will agree to peace? The war is not an international secret; it is being waged in public, and all nations are suf-

fering. Has not the world a right to know why bloodshed continues? Is it not due to the neutral nations that the participants should give not vague generalities, but definite and explicit statements as to the end sought? If the belligerents are too much absorbed in the struggle to consider the rights of neutrals, do they not owe it to their own brave soldiers and their own suffering people to answer the question, 'Why do we die?'

"Who knows but that peace may be possible now —not a truce, but a permanent and enduring peace? If the nations will only make known for what they are fighting they may find it possible to come to a satisfactory understanding. Recrimination as to what is being done and silence as to what is desired —these mean an indefinite prolongation of the struggle. The only possible hope of reaching an end lies in a frank statement by each nation of its position. In announcing the terms which will be acceptable, the nations will be restrained by a sense of responsibility, because upon the nation or nations which demand conditions which are unjust must rest the blame for a continuation of the inde-

scribable woes of this unspeakable war. The conditions of peace must be announced ultimately; why not now?"

The Seizure of Colonies

Professor G. Lowes Dickinson, of Cambridge, opposes vigorously the change in the control of colonies as a result of conquest. He writes:

"Sir Harry Johnston contemplates the retention by the victorious allies of all the German colonies. That this is likely to happen I concede, and, in particular, that the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, rather than our government at home, will have the decisive voice in the matter; but I differ from Sir Harry in thinking that that policy will be not admirable but disastrous.

"This country went into the war ostensibly in defense of Belgium and France, and (as we are constantly told) in order to defeat German schemes of world-empire. On the other hand, the Germans went into the war (I speak of the people, not of the government) in the belief that their independence and integrity were threatened by an aggressive at-

tack from the Triple Entente. As the war has proceeded, the common theme of German publicists and pamphleteers has been that England engineered the war out of jealousy of German trade and in order to continue and complete that policy of world-dominion which she has steadily pursued for centuries. Now, so far as the origin of the war is concerned, I believe the German version to be false and the English version to be true, but the nations will be judged, and rightly, not by what they said when they went into the war but by what they do when they come out of it. History, I think, will brush away the words and decide by the facts, and what history will find, if the policy Sir Harry Johnston advocates is pursued, will be that England, having gone to war ostensibly to defend the status quo against German ambition for world-domination, used the victory enormously to increase her already enormous empire and to put permanently at her mercy the trade of her most important rival. In other words, history will justify the German case, on the facts, and dismiss with contempt the British case, and we shall emerge, once more, branded with

that double mark of hypocrisy and unscrupulousness which foreign critics have always affixed to our policy. This will not be matter of congratulation for any Englishman who cares about the honor and reputation of his country.

"Secondly, if the policy proposed is pursued, it must mean a very long war—two years, three years, perhaps ten years—who can tell? Is the cost of these additions to the British and French empires not to be counted? People talk lightly of a war of attrition. But what does this really mean? It means, not merely the destruction of the stored-up capital of centuries, not merely the diversion on an unprecedented scale of productive to unproductive labor, not merely a measure of poverty if not of anarchy after the war, which may render forever impossible any solution of those social problems which are the main concern of all nations, not merely the killing of millions of men in the prime of life with all the incalculable suffering involved; it means further, that an enormous proportion of those men will leave no children behind them. In other words, that the whole stock of Europe will be permanently

and irremediably worsened; for it is the best who are being killed, not the worst. Let that process go on long enough, and it matters very little who wins or loses the war; for European civilization, in either case, will be doomed. That this, the main consideration, the one certain and inevitable result of the war, should be left out of all the calculations of our statesmen and journalists is the gravest feature of the crisis through which we are passing.

"But Sir Harry seems to think that the arrangement to which he looks forward will be a guarantee of future peace, because it will obviate German intrigues in Africa and elsewhere. Wars do not arise from intrigues, they arise from the conditions that provoke intrigues, and those conditions, so far as Germany is concerned, have been, in recent years, her need and desire for colonial markets. Sir Harry proposes that henceforth her access to such markets shall be wholly dependent upon the good-will or the caprice of her inveterate enemies. Does that look like a condition of peace? To me it would seem simply impossible that a nation as strong, as productive, as technically accomplished as the Ger-

mans will ever acquiesce in a position so humiliating and so insecure. Such a Germany would be a permanent center of unrest in Europe. All hope of the reduction of armaments and the destruction of militarism would disappear. We should be back again in the old morass of shifting alliances and counter-alliances: and he would be a bold man who would confidently prophesy that Germany will never find an ally in the East and an opportunity to recover that 'place in the sun' which will be more than ever the object of her policy.

"The nations of Europe, I believe—I do not speak for the journalists or the government—do really desire a settlement which will rule out war in the future. Such a settlement may, indeed, be impossible, but there is one way in which it seems hopeful to approach it. It is the way indicated in your recent supplements, and urged, in some form or other, from many other quarters. That way is a mutual guarantee by all the chief nations against the disturbance by force of an arrangement itself constructed so as to give the fullest possible satisfaction to the national and economic aspirations of

the states. The method of conquest, followed up by alliances to guarantee the conquests, is the direct opposite of this. Upon which of these views shall prevail depends, I believe, the whole future of Western civilization."

International Government

Mr. John A. Hobson, of London, under the title, *Towards International Government*, has presented a trenchant analysis of the conditions of permanent peace. This work can not be too highly commended. Its thesis is thus summed up on the concluding page:

"At the end of the war though the different peoples may still dispute the rights and wrongs of its immediate cause they will seek its deeper origins in the belated survival of the evil arts of militarism and diplomacy with their false outlooks and their group premises. They will refuse to allow the practitioners of these arts to resume their sway over their lives and to force them again like dumb, driven cattle toward the slaughter-house. . . . They will not be deterred from passing to this goal (of

international government with local autonomy) by theories about the absolutism of states or the biological necessity of war or by false analogies from history, but will definitely declare for a commonwealth of nations as the only security for a peaceful civilization in the future."

Restoration of Europe

Europäische Wiederherstellung (Restoration of Europe), by Alfred H. Fried, is a compact and most valuable discussion of the elements involved in the restoration of law and order in Europe. It is the only work of the kind published in German (Zürich, Orell & Fuessli, Publishers, 1915) since the war began. Doctor Fried urges: "The others will have to change their ideas concerning war. We pacifists have predicted what has taken place; we need not learn anew."

The Great Settlement

The Great Settlement, by C. Ernest Fayle, of London, is a valuable discussion of the same problems, with perhaps too much stress laid on changes in the map.

WAYS TO LASTING PEACE

Future of World Peace

The Future of World Peace, by Roger W. Babson, is an excellent discussion of the economic problems involved in world peace.

Social Progress

Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory, by George W. Nasmyth, of the World Peace Foundation, is one of the best of many books looking forward to the social reconstruction of disordered civilization.

Insurance and War

In a suggestive volume on *War and Insurance*, Professor Josiah Royce, of Harvard University, invokes the policy of mutual help through co-operative insurance as a remedy for war.

After War, What?

Under this heading, in March, 1915, the present writer gave a brief analysis of some of the elements needed in lasting peace.*

* Printed in "War and the Breed," *The Beacon Press*, Boston, August, 1915.

"Let us assume that there will be no victory for either side, but that all the nations concerned will find themselves defeated. The Treaty of Peace must be written at last. There are many things which we would like to put into this treaty, things essential to the future security and well-being of Europe. But we shall not get many of them. We may not get any. It may be that the drawn game will end in a truce, not of peace but of exhaustion.

"After the war is over then will begin the work of reconstruction. Then will come the test of our mettle. Can Europe build up a solid foundation of peace amid the havoc of greed and hate? Constructive work belongs to peace; it may take fifty years to put the Continent in order. When the killing is stopped, permanently or for a breathing spell, the forces of law and order must begin mobilization.

"There are many things we need to make civilization stable and wholesome. Every gain counts. We want foreign exploitation limited by law and justice. We want to have diplomacy and armies no longer at the call of adventurers. We want no more

'red rubber,' red copra or red diamonds. We want open diplomacy and we want democracy. Whatever is secret is corrupt, and the control of armies by an unchecked few is a constant menace to human welfare. The people who pay and who die should know what they pay for and why they are called upon to die.

"We want all private profits taken away from war. We want to see armies and navies brought down from the maximum of expense to the minimum of safety. We want to have conscription abolished and military service put on the same voluntary basis as other more constructive trades. A direct cause of modern warfare is the eagerness to find something for overgrown armies and navies to do. We want to abolish piracy at sea and murder from the air. We want to conserve the interests of neutrals and non-combatants. We want to take from war at once its loot and its glory. We hope especially for an abatement of tariffs and the removal of all obstacles that check the flow of commerce. With a free current of trade the eastern half of Europe would lose its commercial unrest. We can

not mend all the defects of geography, but we might refrain from aggravating them. Land-locked nations will not be so tempted to 'hack a way to the sea,' if it is not made artificially distant by barriers to trade. We would like to have nations pay their debts, not struggle in rivalry of borrowing. We would welcome the day of fewer kings, all with limited authority.

"Furthermore we would like to see manhood suffrage everywhere and womanhood suffrage too, Councils of the People instead of 'Concerts of Powers,' effective parliaments, not mere debating societies without power to act. We would like to see land-reforms, tax-reforms, reforms in schools and universities, in judicial procedure, in religion, sanitation and temperance, with the elimination of caste and privilege wherever entrenched. We would like to see every man a potential citizen of the country he lives in. We would like to see the map of Europe redrawn a bit (but not too much) in the interests of freedom and fair play. We would like to see the small nations left as stable as the great ones, for small nations have done more than their share

in the work of civilization. We believe that a nation can have no welfare independent of the individual welfare of its people. That nation is greatest which has most individual initiative along with most abundant life.

"We would like to see Belgium restored to the 'permanent neutrality' which is her right, and Luxemburg as well. We believe that the 'Balkans should belong to the Balkans.' We would like to see, if it may be, Constantinople neutralized and autonomy restored to Alsace-Lorraine, to Finland, to Armenia; to hear from the Danes in northern Schleswig and from the Poles in Warsaw, Posen and Galicia. The peoples especially concerned should be consulted over every change in boundary lines. We would insist that The Hague Conference be made up wholly of serious men, not baffled by diplomatists, sparring for advantage. We would like to see The Hague Tribunal dignified as the International Court of the World, to extend and create international law by its precedents. We would like to have judicial procedure and arbitral decisions everywhere take the place of war talk and

war preparations. To see the channels of commerce opened wide, neutralized, unfortified and free to all the world—the Bosporus, the Dardanelles, the Straits of Denmark, Gibraltar and Aden, the Canals of Suez, Panama and Kiel as well. Above all we should hope to have human life held as sacred as the flag, and patriotism become 'planetary,' not merely tribal or provincial. Whatever is good for the world is good for every nation in it. All this leaves task enough for the lovers of peace.

"Not much of all this may go into the coming treaty of peace. But the struggle will go on, the most intense since the days of the Reformation. A few resolute men, reckless of consequences, brought on the great war. A few men, equally resolute, could make war impossible, if they had the support their cause deserves."

A Peace Proposal

Among schemes set forth by business men, the "*Peace Proposal*" of Charles L. Bernheimer, of New York, is worthy of attention. This is based on the principle that "as a friend sometimes be-

comes an enemy, by just treatment an enemy may be made a friend." In this plan public opinion should demand peace, and the public opinion of America should ask from the president a "commission on immediate action." The civilian should be fully represented and the Golden Rule should be recognized as bearing a relation to international law. This will imply settlement on the basis of conciliation and arbitration.

Interests of Neutral Nations

Havelock Ellis insists on the basic principle that war is no longer "the private concern of the nations that choose to fight." The war involves and injures every neutral nation, and those who began the war by that fact made themselves the "enemies of all the world." Without the participation of neutral nations no lasting peace can be arranged.

Interchangeable Citizenship

Darwin P. Kingsley, president of the New York Life Insurance Company, insists on the necessity

of "interchangeable citizenship" in the civilized nations, as it exists among the forty-eight states of the American union. This has widened the old-time type of state or colonial patriotism into a national feeling. This would, in itself, break down the evil side of nationality, of which the narrow, selfish form of patriotism is an expression, while preserving all that is worth while in local self-government and local pride in conditions and in achievement.

The American Institute in Belgium

From Belgium, through Senator Henri La Fontaine and George Sarton, comes the proposition of an American institute to propagate in Europe the fundamental and workable ideals of America. These are in brief: democratic freedom, free trade among federated states, interchangeable citizenship within these states, local home rule with mutual understandings in matters of common interest, armies and navies international only, free schools, secular schools, free religion, and with all these the development of a broadened patriotism and a form

of discipline, not through outside compulsion, but through personal training and loyalty to the common interests of society.

"America in many regards is more advanced than Europe. She is more peaceful and brotherly, the spirit of true democracy has been better unfolded there. But the élite of the American people do not underestimate all that they owe to the mother countries from which they came. They would be only too glad to give them in return as an homage of filial gratitude a part of the immense experience of the New World.

"This is not an easy task, however, because Europe is so old. She is proud, she is not very ready, perhaps, to listen to the teaching of young America. Old folks do not like to be taught by children, by their children."

The pretext for such an institute is found in the need of Belgium. "What Belgium will need is a moral and educational help. She will not need American money, but American ideals. And the same can be said of all Europe." An American institute in Belgium, in Holland, or in Switzerland

"would be a living center of international information and good-will."

Fundamentals of Peace

Mr. August Schvan, a Swedish officer, now become a strong champion of peace, in a plea for "Planetary Patriotism" insists first on the necessity of free trade in Europe. Free trade among the United States of America has formed one of the strongest bonds of union, as competing tariffs have formed a main cause of discord. The federation of the German states put an end to the local customs office, and this achievement has been one of the great factors in the progress of Germany. Free trade and interchangeable citizenship, the special features of Mr. Schvan's plan, would of themselves bring about a practical federation of the United States of Europe.

The central feature of Mr. Schvan's plan is the acceptance of the "principle of nationality to which universal free trade, a world citizenship, an international supreme court, an international maritime police fleet and general disarmament form a neces-

sary complement. There would be no point at all in having within a sovereign state any not perfectly satisfied area." Mr. Schvan very justly opposes two conceptions sometimes put forward by some who work for peace. The one is the forcible establishment of democracy throughout the world; the other is the creation of a world-parliament to frame laws for the whole earth.

Very few legislative statutes are suitable to all kinds of conditions and to all parts of the world. There is already too much centralization in the civilized world at the expense of local self-government. "People who talk about an international parliament must either overlook the fact that the great majority of mankind is bound to earth, or secretly advocate the replacement of the autocracy of the sword by the tyranny of theoretic speculation."

Mr. Schvan believes that the root of much of the evil in Europe lies with the outworn system of diplomacy which, confirmed in the Congress of Vienna which followed the downfall of Napoleon,

"sowed the seeds of all the wars of the last hundred years. The coming congress can make this war the last of all wars by totally abolishing all diplomacy and foreign policy. The real and the only way to control diplomacy is to shut the doors of every state department and of every foreign office in the world."

Referring to the position of the United States as possible mediator in Europe, Mr. Schvan observes:

"To fulfil their great mission, the people of America must display in their thinking a little of that courage which now runs to waste on the blood-soaked fields of Europe because men have been taught to die for their country. It ought to teach mankind a far nobler conception—that of living for their country."

Says Edmond Demolins, of Paris: "State patriotism founded on political ambition is but an artificial, spurious patriotism, which leads peoples to ruin. True patriotism consists in energetically maintaining private independence against the de-

velopment and encroachments of the state, because such is the only way of ensuring social power and prosperity for the fatherland."

Science in Personal and National Right

In Milan Professor Umano has proposed a more serious application of science to the fundamental basis in national and international right. Science is the result of human experience tested and set in order. It is the most international and cosmopolitan of all human activities and its teachings are totally opposed to the mixture of sordid brutality and romantic sentimentalism which lies behind the activities of war.

Umano argues that medicine ceased to be charlatanism when men began seriously to study the positive facts of anatomy with which every school of medicine has to deal. As science progressed the various honest workers for the physical well-being of humanity came into closer relation, for they must all recognize fundamental truth.

Politics will leave the domain of charlatanism when it is understood that it must begin at the be-

ginning with the positively ascertained facts of human right as disclosed by the method of science. Because current discussions of governmental affairs are based on fancy, whim and tradition, not on science, these discussions have little value. Politics constitute, therefore, "an entangling snare for honest statesmen, a happy hunting-ground for malicious adventurers—the source of a daily deluge of wordy speeches."

Umano calls attention to the manifold achievements of science and their application to man's needs as a result of the inductive study of fundamental truths. But, he asks, "Who can assert that statesmen have also struggled day and night to discover and to announce to the world any new facts revealing further truth about the science of government? Political leaders have struggled day and night, truly, but either willingly or unwillingly . . . have often hindered the discovery of real facts relating to the science of government. So, unlike the edifice of science, the shameful political chaos we have to-day is the product of ignorance. Our civilization is morally mildewed . . . im-

bued with barbarous prejudices on government, which keep alive selfishness, poverty, ugliness, deceit and wickedness. . . . They allow . . . no leisure in which to turn . . . to the supreme knowledge—to the knowledge of good and evil in reference to the mystery of life and to the quest of a better way of understanding . . . the times in which we live."

Umano appeals for an International Conference of able men to form a "basis of Positive Scientific Principles of Government upon which to study and eventually solve the gravest problems of the day," this to replace the current "balderdash, a rehash of ancient empirical phrases which sound like noisy yawnings in comparison with the reality to which the positive methods of all other sciences have accustomed us. No serious result can be hoped from such chatter. Every one discusses such problems, not on the basis of positive principles of government but on the basis of empirical opinions easily contradicted by other opinions."

Umano goes on to show that the recognized forms of personal and public right have been extorted

one by one from despotic rulers in days when each demand for freedom was punished as crime. The leaders toward freedom "faced prison and even death itself in order to denounce and put down government arrogance and enabling humanity to enjoy the small amount of government sincerity we possess to-day. But they generally deduced their principles from their own political tendencies, not from a pure scientific inquiry. Some of them founded their principles of government on abstract or divine realities instead of on real human exigencies."

Hence Umano makes a new appeal for a consensus of positive principles of human relations, cut loose from history and tradition and based on the unchanging principles of science. (*Cœnobium*, Lugano, Switzerland, May, 1914.)

The personal rights of men as we now understand them have been won by hard struggles against tyranny. They have often been imperfectly won, and under deceptive names. The law of nations shows the same imperfections. It is time now, with all our breadth of knowledge that

law should rest on a basis of science, not of tradition.

Changes in the Map

Numerous authors have found the key to the problems of European society in alterations of the political map. It is not clear that any or all of these alterations, ranging from the return of the stolen Dobruja to Bulgaria to the wholesale revision of Germany in the *Charte des Nations* of M. Jean L'Homme, would in any degree reduce the unrest of nations or the prospects of international war. If national security is our aim, no change in boundaries should be made in time of war, as a result of war, or except by a general consent of the people and the nations concerned. Justice may sometimes demand an abrupt change—as at present in Armenia—but not usually the interests of peace.

A present transfer of Alsace-Lorraine to France would not quiet the problem of that distressed nationality. More important than change of boundaries is the spread of justice and freedom within the boundaries. The plans for drastic remodeling

of the map of Europe must be considered as useless and so far as their influence goes, mischievous. Little thought seems to have been expended on the map of Africa, but the disposition of that gigantic area looms large among the problems of the future.

Mr. H. G. Wells, who is especially interested in alterations in political geography, makes the following demands:

"1. An indemnity to Belgium, with extension to Aix-la-Chapelle, Mortmedy and Montjoie, with neutralization of the Rheinland.

"2. The future of Alsace-Lorraine to be decided by France.

"3. An autonomous Poland under the Czar, to include all Polish districts but no other.

"4. A greater Serbia, Roumania and Bulgaria.

"5. An independent Bohemia.

"6. The division of Turkey.

"7. Serbia and Italy jointly to bar Austria from the Adriatic."

These changes would involve "rights of conquest," and should be vitiated by that very fact. But the conquests essential to the scheme have yet

to be made. All indemnities whatsoever and all "rights of conquest" simply point the way to future conflict.

A World-City of Civilization

Among the many attempts to humanize civilization, a great majority rest on law or on education, a very few on co-operative international action. Of these few, the most heroic, the most picturesque and the most daring is the conception of a co-operative world-city of civilization. This has been the lifework of Hendrik Christian Andersen, a Norwegian-American artist, long resident in Rome.

Mr. Andersen has conceived a world-city, perfect in all its appointments, a creation and not a growth, its adjustments perfect, its architecture altogether artistic, its sanitation above reproach, its appointments all that the best intelligence and artistic sense can make them, to be the worthy capital of the world at its best, the city when complete to be wholly neutral, owned by all nations alike—as the District of Columbia is the equal property of all American states.

It should be built by co-operative effort, and such effort binds together all involved in the labor. In the words of Mr. Soterios Nicholson, one of Mr. Andersen's disciples:

"Long has the world wasted its energy in dissension and in discord. Vainly has it sought to remedy the ill through the machinery of diplomacy. The spirit of unity can be bred, if at all, by actual collaboration, by contact of soul with soul and muscle with muscle in tests of creative import. The world-city, when established, will register a great step in the realization of this lofty ideal."

The proposed city is an oblong rectangle about three times as long as broad with a broad avenue of nations in the midst, with squares and circles, a tower of progress near the end, a zoological garden and stadium near the other.

The details have been all set forth in a folio volume de luxe, itself a work of art of great importance. The artist has worked without reward toward a supreme purpose, which the world will some time rise to appreciate. In Mr. Nicholson's

words, "the prize has been the effort itself—the compensation the fruits picked along the way."

Now that the plans are made, two questions arise. Where shall the city be built and who shall build it? To the second of these we can give no answer. Some time the world will rise to the level of the artist, but not yet. Some time some one will say, as the Boston people said of Agassiz: "We will not stand by and see so brave a man struggle without aid."

This may be far in the future, but the work is done and it is well worth doing.

Where shall the world-city stand? Preferably in a small nation, for, under present evil conditions, in the hyena stage of nationality, great nations are jealous of one another. It can not replace any existing city, for to tear down as well as to build would double all difficulties as well as all expense. The suburbs of a great city, or a picturesque site in the mountains or by the sea are favorably indicated. In these matters Mr. Andersen expresses no choice; he is interested primarily in the work, not in the location.

The following localities are under consideration until the money necessary is provided. The choice can be made when the foundation stones are in sight.

A suburb of The Hague in Holland; Tervueren, a suburb of Brussels; Athens; Berne; Macarese, a suburb of Ostia, port of Rome; Fréjus in the Riviera of France, on the sea adjoining the picturesque mountains of the Esterel; Montmorency, near Paris, or some place as Atlantic City or Asbury Park on the coast of New Jersey.

In the interest of historic sentiment we may well place Athens first. For picturesque beauty of site, Berne or Fréjus; for convenience, The Hague or Brussels; and there are locations beautiful and fit in Alsace or along the Rhine.

But all this must be left to the "World Conscience," which shall have the details of building on its hands. The most that any one can do now is to give a word of appreciation to the heroic artist who so unflinchingly has followed the sublime vision.

CHAPTER VII

THE CASE AGAINST WAR

The Peace That Shall Last

UNDER the heading *Toward the Peace That Shall Last,** a committee meeting in New York, composed of Miss Jane Addams, Miss Emily G. Balch, William Kent, of California, Hamilton Holt, Lillian D. Wald, Paul U. Kellogg and about fifteen other leading journalists and students of social affairs, has furnished the best-considered indictment of war that has yet been published.

The points against war are taken up in this document, one after another, and stated epigrammatically, without argument and without reference to historic examples.

The following paragraphs comprise the greater part of this remarkable document:

"At every stage of warfare in the past, there have been men and women in all nations who have

* *The Survey,* New York.

endeavored to abate and lessen it. Their repeated endeavors have been answered only by repeated wars, until the present war in Europe completes the work of death, desolation and tyranny.

"In spite of this, these protests against war are destined to succeed; as, centuries earlier in the history of the race, the sentiment of pity, of respect for human life, called a halt to senseless slaughter.

"There came the time, for example, to Greek and Jewish peoples when the few set their faces against human sacrifice as a religious rite of their highest faith—bound up, like our wars, with old fealties and solemn customs and with their most desperate fears. Humble men and women, out of sheer affection for their kind, revolted. In face of persecution and ridicule they warned their countrymen that in pouring human blood upon altars to the gods, they wrought upon their kind more irreparable wrong than any evil which they sought to forfend. Finally there came to be enough people with courage and pity sufficient to carry a generation with them.

"It took these peoples many centuries to rid themselves of human sacrifice; during many centuries more they relapsed again and again, in periods of national despair. So have we fallen back into warfare, and perhaps will fall back again and again, until, in self-pity, in self-defense, in self-assertion of the right to life, not as hitherto, a few, but the whole people of the world, will brook this thing no longer.

"By that opportunity, now ours as never before, to weigh the case against war and to draw the counts from burning words spoken by those who protest and who are of all peoples—we make single judgment and complete indictment.

"By that good fortune which has placed us outside the conflict; by that ill fortune by which the belligerent and his rights have heretofore bestrode the world; by mine-strewn channels, and by international codes which offer scant redress—we speak as people of a neutral nation.

"By the unemployed of our water-fronts, and the augmented misery of our cities; by the financial depression which has curtailed our school build-

ing and crippled our works of good-will; by the sluicing of human impulse among us from channels of social development to the back-eddies of salvage and relief—we have a right to speak.

"By the hot anger and civil strife that we have known; by our pride, vain-glory and covetousness; by the struggles we have made for national integrity and defense of our hearthstones; by our consciousness that every instinct and motive and ideal at work in this war, however lofty or however base, has had some counterpart in our national history and our current life—we can speak a common language.

"By that comradeship among nations which has made for mutual understanding; by those inventions which, binding us in communication, have put the horrors of war at our doors; by the mechanical contrivances which have multiplied and intensified those horrors; by the quickening human sympathies which have made us sensitive to the hurts of others—we can speak as fellow victims of this great oppression.

"By our heritage from the embattled nations;

by our debt to them for languages and faiths and social institutions; for science, scholarship and invention; by the broken and desolated hearts that will come to us when the war ends; by our kinships and our unfeigned friendships—we can speak as brothers.

"By all these things we hold the present opportunity for conscience-searching and constructive action to be an especial charge upon us; upon the newcomers among us from the fatherlands; and upon the joint youth of all the peoples of the two Americas.

"War has brought low our conception of the preciousness of human life as slavery brought low our conception of human liberty.

"It has benumbed our growing sense of the nurture of life; and at a time when we were challenging Reichstag, Parliament and Congress with the needlessness of infant mortality and child labor, it has entrenched a million youths with cold and fever and impending death.

"It has thwarted the chance of our times for the fulfilment of life, and scattered like burst

shrapnel the hands of the sculptors and the violinists, the limbs of the hurdlers and the swimmers, the sensitive muscles of the mechanics and the weavers, the throats of the singers and the interpreters, the eyes of the astronomers and the melters—every skilled and prescient part of the human body, every gift and competence of the human mind.

"It has set back our promptings toward the conservation of life; and in a decade when England and France and Russia, Germany and Austria and Belgium, have been working out social insurance against the hazards of peace, it has thrown back upon the world an unnumbered company of the widowed and the fatherless, of crippled breadwinners and of aged parents, left bereft and destitute.

"It has blocked our way toward the ascent of life; and in a century which has seen the beginnings of efforts to upbuild the common stock, it has cut off from parenthood the strong, the courageous and the high-spirited.

"It has, in its development of armaments, pitted human flesh against machinery.

"It has brought strange men to the door-sills of peaceful people; men like their own men, bearing no grudges against them; men snatched away from their fields and villages where their fathers lie buried, to kill and burn and destroy till this other people are driven from their homes of a thousand years or sit abject and broken.

"It has stripped farms and ruined self-sustaining communities, and poured into a bewildered march for succor the lame and aged and bedridden, the little children and the women great with child unborn.

"It has set vast communities at the task of rehabilitating economic gains won through centuries of struggle and sacrifice; and not until these are regained will they be free to think not merely of living, but of better life.

"It has razed the flowing lines in which the art and aspiration of earlier generations expressed themselves, and has thus waged war upon the dead.

"It has tortured and twisted the whole social fabric of the living.

"It has burdened our children and our children's children with a staggering load of debt.

"It has inundated the lowlands of the world's economy with penury and suffering unreckonable, hopelessly undermining standards of living already much too low.

"It has blasted our new internationalism in the protection of working women and children.

"It has rent and trampled upon the network of world co-operation in trade and craftsmanship which was making all men fellow workers.

"It has distracted our minds with its business of destruction and has stayed the forward reach of the builders among men.

"It has conscripted physician and surgeon, summoning them from research and the prolongation of life to the patchwork of its wreckage.

"It has sucked into its blood and mire our most recent conquests over the elements—over electricity and air and the depths of ocean; and has prostituted our prowess in engineering, chemistry and technology to the service of terror and injury.

"It has rent our trade routes and systems of transportation into runways to its slaughter-pens, so that neither volcanoes, nor earthquakes, nor

famine, but only the plagues, can match war in unbounded disaster.

"It has, by its compulsory service, made patriotism a shell, empty of liberty.

"It has wrested the power of self-defense from the hands of freemen who wielded lance and sword and scythe, and has set them as machine tenders to do the bidding of their masters.

"It has set up the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

"It has substituted arbitrary authority for the play of individual conscience; and the morals of foot-loose men who escape identity in the common uniform, for that social pressure which in household and village, in neighborhood and state, makes for personal responsibility, for decency and fair play.

"It has battened on apathy, unintelligence and helplessness, such as surrender the judgment and volition of nations into a few hands; and has nullified rights and securities, such as are of inestimable value to the people and formidable to tyrants only.

"It has threatened the results of a hundred martyrdoms and revolutions, and put in jeopardy those free governments which make possible still newer social conquests.

"It has crushed under iron heels the uprisings of civilization itself.

"It has massed and exploded the causes of strife.

"It has not only shattered men's breasts, but has let loose the black fury of their hearts; so that in rape, and cruelty, and rage, ancient brutishness trails at the heels of all armies.

"It has set faithful against faithful, priest against priest, prayers against prayers for that success of one army which means slaughter for both.

"It has made werewolves of neighboring peoples, in the imaginations of each other.

"It has put its stamp upon growing boys and girls, and taught them to hate other children who have chanced to be born on the other side of some man-made boundary.

"It has inbred with the ugliest strains of commercialism, perverting to its purposes the increase

of over-dense populations and their natural yearning for new opportunities for enterprise and livelihood.

"It has whetted among neutral nations a lust to profit by furnishing the means to prolong its struggles.

"It has turned the towers of art and science into new Babels, so that our philosophers and men of letters, our physicists and geographers, our economists and biologists and dramatists speak in strange tongues; and to hate each other has become a holy thing among them.

"It has found a world of friends and neighbors, and substituted a world of outlanders and aliens and enemies.

"It has burned itself into men's souls as an evil fact of life, to be accepted along with every other good and evil, instead of what it is—a survival of barbarism which can and should be ended.

"It has violated the finer sensibilities of the race, and weakened our claim upon them for the betterment of the conditions under which people live.

"It has given the lie to the teachings of missionaries and educators, and will stay civilization in the uttermost parts of the earth.

"It has lessened the number of those who feel the joys and sorrows of all peoples as of their own.

"It has strangled truth and paralyzed the power and wish to face it, and has set up monstrous and irreconcilable myths of self-justification.

"It has mutilated the human spirit.

"It has become a thing which passeth all understanding.

"We have heard the call from overseas of those who have appealed to men and women of good-will in all nations to join with them in throwing off this tyranny upon life.

"We would go further; we would throw open a peace which should be other than a shadow of old wars and a foreshadowing of new. We do more than plead with men to stay their hands from killing. We hail living men. As peace-lovers, we charge them with the sanctity of human life; as democrats and freemen, we charge them with its sovereignty.

"By the eight million natives of the warring states living among us without malice or assault one upon another, we would leave the occasions of fighting no longer for idle war boards to decide.

"By the blow our forbears struck at barbarism when they took vengeance out of private hands, we would wrest the manufacture of armaments and deadly weapons from the gun-mongers and powder-makers who gain by it.

"By those electric currents that have cut the ground from under the old service of diplomacy, and spread the new intelligence, we would put the ban upon intrigue and secret treaties.

"For we hold that not soldiers, nor profit-takers, nor diplomats, but the people who suffer and bear the brunt of war, should determine whether war must be; that with ample time for investigation and publicity of its every cause and meaning, with recourse to every avenue for mediation and settlement abroad, war should come only by the slow process of self-willing among men and women who solemnly publish and declare it to be a last and sole resort.

"With our treatied borderland, three thousand miles in length, without fort or trench from Atlantic to Pacific, which has helped weld us for a century of unbroken peace with our neighbors to the north, we would spread faith, not in entrenched camps, but in open boundaries.

"With the pact of our written constitution before us, which binds our own sovereign states in amity, we are convinced that treaty-making may be lifted to a new and inviolable estate, and become the foundation for that world organization which for all time shall make for peace on earth and goodwill among men.

"With our experience in lesser conflicts in industrial life, which have none the less embraced groups as large as armies, have torn passions and rasped endurance to the uttermost, we can bear testimony that at the end of such strife as cleaves to the heart of things, men are disposed to lay the framework of their relations in larger molds than those which broke beneath them.

"With our ninety million people, drawn from Alpine and Mediterranean, Danubean, Baltic and

Slavic stocks, with a culture blended from these different affluents, we hold that progress lies in the predominance of none; and that the civilization of each nation needs to be refreshed by that commingling with the genius and the type of other human groups, that blending which began on the coast lands and islands of the Ægean Sea, where European civilization first drew its sources from the Euphrates and the Nile.

"With memories of the tyranny which provoked our Revolution, with the travail still upon us by which our people in turn paid for the subjection of another race, with the bitterness only now assuaged which marked our period of mistrust and reconstruction, we bear witness that boundaries should be set where not force, but justice and consanguinity, direct; and that, however boundaries fall, liberty and the flowering out of native culture should be secure.

"With America's fair challenge to the spirit of the east and to the chivalry of the west in standing for the open door in China when that empire, now turned republic, was threatened by dismem-

berment, we call for the freeing of the ports of every ocean from special privilege based on territorial claim—throwing them open with equal chance to all who by their ability and energy can serve new regions with mutual benefit.

"With the faith our people have kept with Cuba, the regard we have shown for the integrity of Mexico and our preparations for the independence of the Philippine Islands, we urge the framing of a common colonial policy which shall put down that predatory exploitation which has embroiled the west and oppressed the east, and shall stand for an opportunity for each latent and backward race to build up according to its own genius.

"By our full century of ruthless waste of forest, ore and fuel; by the vision which has come to us in these later days, of conserving to the permanent uses of the people the water-power and natural wealth of our public domain, we propose the laying down of a world policy of conservation.

"By that tedium and monotony of life and labor endured by vast multitudes until, when war drums sound, the wage-earner leaps from his bench, and

the harvester forsakes his field, we hold that the ways of peace should be so cast as to make stirring appeal to the heroic qualities in men, and give common utterance to the rhythm and beauty of national feeling.

"By the joy of our people in the conquest of a continent; by the rousing of all Europe, when the great navigators threw open the new Indies and the New World, we conceive a joint existence such that the achieving instincts among men, not as one nation against another, nor as one class against another, but as one generation after another, shall have freedom to come into their own."

CHAPTER VIII

WORLD FEDERATION

The Federation of Europe

THE Federation of Europe may be possible just so soon or so far as the European peoples of these states take possession of their governments. The present war is the natural outcome of the "double standard" of politics. In democratic Europe the people create and maintain the nation, and the morality of the state is a measure of the collective morality of the people. In other regions, the theory has been taught for centuries that the state is above the people, who are its chattels, and that the state can not do wrong, as there is no authority above it. Individuals are capable of right and wrong because the state can enforce its standards upon them. These standards, the work of the state, are made evident by the force of the state and the authority of the state church. The duty of a

good citizen has been thus summed up: "*Soldat sein; Steuer zahlen; Mund halten.*" ("Be a soldier; pay taxes; hold your tongue.") The small state has no rights in this system because it has no power to enforce its rights. It is merely part of a sphere of influence. "The one sin on the part of a state is feebleness; politically it is the sin against the Holy Ghost."

It is evident that a state under autocratic diction can not readily federate with a state that the people control. It is evident also that, given an adequate number of political agitators, each type of state is a menace to the other.

No one can see a month ahead into the history of Europe. It is, however, probable that there may exist the materials for a league of peace, a league of self-governing people to whom the army will be merely of the nature of police for mutual protection. Such a league would be essentially a democracy, for real peace rests on a condition of mutual trust.

Free trade within Europe along with interchangeable citizenship and the suppression of se-

cret diplomacy would virtually raise the European states to the condition of those in America. It would be a similar federation, with considerable more emphasis laid on "State Rights." It will not be easily secured, but nothing politically worth while can be gained without great effort. "Small efforts," says John Stuart Mill, "do not produce great effects. They produce no effects at all." The Congress of Vienna, after the downfall of Napoleon, tried to provide for perpetual peace by exalting the power of the kings and cutting up the territories as though the people were mere flocks of sheep. The constructive work of the future must stand on a broader basis. It must consider, not the status of dynasties or the traditions of nationality, but the actual welfare of the people themselves.

To a large extent, the democratic nations of Europe now trust one another. Allies perforce in times of war, the real alliance will endure in times of peace. It is a mutual arrangement for mutual security. Such an alliance would be greatly strengthened by customs unions and postal unions.

It is likely that the Federation will exist in fact before it does in form. The fact is the real thing. The United States of Europe will grow up of itself when the people everywhere take charge of their own affairs. World politics has become more pressing than local politics and it can no longer be carried on in the dark. Its "ape and tiger" degeneration comes from the fact that in most nations it has lain in the hands of the privileged few, hermetically sealed from the light of publicity.

The loose relation that joins the dominions of Great Britain is perhaps the most natural type of the Federation of Europe. A single unified world government, under one set of men gathered at some one place, is only a dream and not a very promising one at that. What the world needs is more self-control, more personal responsibility, more willingness to live and let live, not more governmental machinery. Nevertheless, every bond of union in international life helps the advance of civilization. Every step in removing injustice, in eliminating sources of friction, in extending common interests, in making war more difficult, are all

steps to the final aim—mutual trust and international co-operation. The humanization of nations means the passing of war.

"The muddy stream of hatred and falsehood," says Doctor Heilberg, of Breslau,* "has inundated and covered with mud many things, but when that stream shall have passed away, sooner or later (let us hope it will be soon), peace will have been concluded, and from out this mud there will grow and blossom again the honest common work, mutual esteem, mutual love and the spiritual unity of all who will serve the common welfare of humanity."

Utopia or Hell

The conception of a continent, in which each nation should be governed by wisdom, and that wisdom the resultant of the collective intelligence of the people, is yet far from realization. It is, in fact, a dream of Utopia. And yet it must by degrees become actual if civilization is not to end in a blind sac and a pool of blood. The issue is frankly presented. In the words of Hamilton Holt,

* *Vossische Zeitung*, January, 1915.

the goal must be "Utopia or Hell," civilization or militarism. And all those who believe in the nobility of human nature, who believe that every human problem can be solved by human intelligence, who believe that this is God's world and not the Devil's, should face the future undismayed.

From a private letter of a distinguished professor in the University of London, under the date of August 18, 1914, I take these words:

"I want you to realize the conviction among many friends of peace and sanity in Europe that the fate of civilization in the present crisis may depend chiefly on the action of the United States.

"The war must come to an end some day, but the patient efforts of a neutral and disinterested power may make the difference between one year and ten years of fighting and starving. That power can only be America—for she alone among the great powers is really disinterested. And it is fortunate for the world that President Wilson has inspired throughout Europe, not only confidence in his motives, but personal regard. . . .

"In the presence of such an enormous complex-

ity of interests and passions, any approach to a European understanding must be slow and difficult, but it may be possible to create a basis, however uncertain, for future negotiation. . . .

"A few months ago it would have seemed Utopian, in spite of all the religions and philosophies, to urge that the members of any great nation should act from mere pity for the men and women who make up with them the human race. To-day it seems the simplest and strongest of all claims."

The Passing of Nationalism

The conception of a world dominated spiritually by one priest and physically by one emperor, ruling likewise by divine right, and to whom kings, princes and cities in varied fashion paid tribute, passed away with the Middle Ages. This loose-jointed imperialism gave way to the compact individual units of feudalism. The struggle of rival cities, of greedy barons and of lawless soldiers of fortune wrought the downfall of feudalism.

Nationalism, the federated alliances of like groups, succeeded. A nation is a body of people

at peace among themselves. The good side of nationalism is evident, the development of local institutions, of local pride and of neighborly goodwill. But the evil passions of men have given it an evil side. The national feeling or "patriotism" that spends itself in envy, fear or hatred of one's neighbors is a thoroughly evil spirit. By forcing the arming of nations against one another this spirit has brought about the greatest catastrophe in the history of the world. That one nation may be more to blame for this than another does not change the nature of the calamity. All civilized nations were heavily armed, grotesquely, crushingly, wickedly armed. The great achievement of a few decades of peace had brought civilization to an estate of which militant feudalism could not conceive. The abuse of nationalism has carried Europe backward financially and socially for a generation, biologically for a century. It has put the whole system of nationalism on trial. It has forced the world to look forward to the next era, that of Federation. Complete federation with autonomy must sooner or later follow nationalism, even

as partial race federation (nationalism) succeeded the anarchy of feudalism. Such a change will not take place instantly, nor without opposition. But the progress of the federated states of our union, each of which, retaining autonomy or local self-government, has given up its armies, its tariffs and its special citizenship for the common good, indicates the route which civilized government must traverse. As surely as feudalism gave place to nationalism, as certainly as day follows the night, so must Nationalism merge into Federation in the movement of civilization.

APPENDIX

The Peace Pilgrimage

AN ATTEMPT to call the attention of the world to the need of immediate peace through a demonstration on the part of neutral nations is projected by Mr. Henry Ford, of Detroit. This movement can not fail to have important results through voicing a wide-spread yearning for peace, though its effects may not be immediate or even visible. At the least, it is an honest attempt to make new history in a new way. The nature and the purpose of this "Peace Pilgrimage" are thus set forth in personal letters by Mr. Ford:

"From the moment I realized that the world situation demands immediate action if we do not want the war fire to spread any further, I joined those international forces which are working toward ending this unparalleled catastrophe. This I recognize as my human duty. . . .

"Envoys to thirteen belligerent and neutral governments have ascertained in forty visits that there is a universal peace desire. This peace desire, for the sake of diplomatic etiquette, never can be expressed openly or publicly until one side or the other is definitely defeated or until both sides are entirely exhausted.

"For fifteen months the people of the world have waited for the governments to act; have waited for governments to lead Europe out of its unspeakable agony and suffering and to prevent Europe's entire destruction. As European neutral governments are unable to act without co-operation of our government, and as our government for unknown reasons has not offered this co-operation, no further time can be wasted in waiting for governmental action.

"In order that their sacrifice may not have been in vain, humanity owes it to the millions of men led like cattle to the slaughter house, that a supreme effort be made to stop this wicked waste of life.

"The people of the belligerent countries did not

want the war. The people did not make it. The people want peace. The world looks to us, to America, to lead in ideals. The greatest mission ever before a nation is ours. . . .

"Men and women of our country representing all its ideals and all of its activities will start from New York on the fourth of December aboard the Scandinavian-American Steamship, *Oscar II.* The peace ship which carries the American delegation will proceed to Christiania [thence to Stockholm and Copenhagen, reinforced at each point by workers for democracy, thence to The Hague, meeting delegations from Switzerland and Spain].

"From all these various delegations will be selected a small deliberative body which shall sit in one of the neutral capitals. Here it will be joined by a limited number of authorities of international promise from each belligerent country. . . . This international conference will be an agency for continuous mediation. It will be dedicated to the stoppage of this hideous international carnage and . . . to the prevention of future wars through the abolition of competitive armaments. . . .

APPENDIX

"In case of a governmental call, . . . we will then place our united strength solidly behind those entrusted by the governments to carry on peace negotiations."

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 047 627 5